DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 025 HE 001 854

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Effective Use of Resources in State Higher Education: Graduate Education, Community Colleges, Education for Blacks. |
| INSTITUTION | Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga. |
| PUB DATE | Aug 70 |
| NOTE | 47p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30313 ($1.50) |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.45 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Community Colleges, Educational Opportunities, Educational Planning, *Graduate Study, *Higher Education, Junior Colleges, *Negro Colleges, Negro Students, Planning, *Statewide Planning |

ABSTRACT

The papers in this volume were delivered at a Symposium on the "Effective Use of Resources in State Higher Education" at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Education Board in Houston, Texas, June 11-12, 1970. The papers deal with three general subjects: (1) the orderly development of graduate education; (2) evaluating the community junior college; and (3) maximizing opportunity for black students. The papers in the first category are: "A Governor Comments," by Governor Robert W. Scott; "Doctoral Planning for the Seventies: A Challenge to the States," by Lyman A. Glenny; "The Care and Nurture of Teaching Scholars," by Alvin H. Proctor; and "A State Senator Replies," by Lamar R. Plunkett. The papers in the second area are: "Community Colleges: A Friendly Critique," by James L. Wattenbarger; "A Governor Comments," by Governor Arch A. Moore, Jr.; and "Trends, Problems and Opportunities," by LeRoy A. Cornelsen. The papers in the third category are: "State Planning for Expanded Opportunity," by D. Robert Graham; "New Roles for Black Colleges," by Herman B. Smith; "The Black Colleges Must Turn Black," by Henry Allen Bullock; and "The Roles of Independent Colleges and Public Junior Colleges in Statewide Planning," by James M. Godard. (AF)

ED0 45025

# Effective Use of Resources in State Higher Education

**Graduate Education** | **Community Colleges** | **Education for Blacks**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE001 854

August 1970

**Southern Regional Education Board**

130 Sixth Street, N. W. Atlanta, Georgia 30313

$1.50

# Foreword

FROM its inception the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) has stressed orderly development of graduate education and the efficient use of resources within and between the states.

The question of rational growth is attracting more attention in the decade of the 1970's as enrollments and costs continue to rise. Our states now face perhaps their greatest challenge in providing postsecondary education appropriate to the needs of society.

Much of SREB's work has centered on efforts to assist the states in planning systems of higher education that will make a maximum contribution to the social and economic development of the region and the nation.

These efforts have included encouragement of sound growth in graduate education. With graduate education costing from two to ten times as much as undergraduate education and with a threatened overabundance of Ph.D. programs, careful planning in this area is especially crucial at this time.

SREB has also stressed the expansion of higher educational opportunity for all of the region's youth, especially its black citizens. In each state there is great need for diverse but closely related institutions with programs designed to meet the needs of all segments of the population.

The papers and statements in this volume were addressed to these concerns and delivered at a symposium on "Effective Use of Resources in State Higher Education" at SREB's annual meeting June 11-12, 1970, at Houston, Texas. We hope that public officials and educators will find the viewpoints useful as they plan further for higher education in their states.

Winfred L. Godwin, *President*
Southern Regional Education Board

# Contents

**I. The Orderly Development of Graduate Education**

A Governor Comments
Governor Robert W. Scott . . . . . 1

Doctoral Planning for the Seventies:
A Challenge to the States
Lyman A. Glenny . . . . . 3

The Care and Nurture of Teaching Scholars
Alvin H. Proctor . . . . . 13

A State Senator Replies
Lamar R. Plunkett . . . . . 18

**II. Evaluating the Community Junior College**

Community Colleges: A Friendly Critique
James L. Wattenbarger . . . . . 19

A Governor Comments
Governor Arch A. Moore, Jr. . . . . 29

Trends, Problems, and Opportunities
LeRoy A. Cornelsen . . . . . 31

**III. Maximizing Opportunity for Black Students**

State Planning for Expanded Opportunity
D. Robert Graham . . . . . 33

New Roles for Black Colleges
Herman B. Smith . . . . . 35

The Black Colleges Must Turn Black
Henry Allen Bullock . . . . . 40

The Roles of Independent Colleges and
Public Junior Colleges in Statewide Planning
James M. Godard . . . . . 43

# I. The Orderly Development of Graduate Education

## A Governor Comments

*Robert W. Scott, Governor of North Carolina*

THE problem of making compatible the various forces at work in the development of graduate education is becoming increasingly complicated. We must expand our educational programs to keep up with the explosion of knowledge and to erase environmental and other problems created by man. We must deal with ambitions of faculty because far too many of them are more concerned about prestige and the fulfillment of their own personal ambitions and education than they are with the orderly development of education. We must, of course, contend with the normal increases in the graduate population, and we must deal with the rapidly rising cost of instruction and research. These are just some of the factors which must be considered in working out a plan for orderly development in education.

Two years ago, North Carolina's Board of Higher Education secured from the public universities of our state a six-year forecast of planned expansion of graduate degree programs. These numbered no less than 166 in master's-level programs, a 60 percent increase over existing programs. In addition, 30 new doctoral programs were proposed.

With the elevation of five more institutions to regional university status and with revisions at other institutions since 1968, I think it is fairly safe to predict the total of graduate programs contemplated could swell to perhaps 250 within the next few years.

The North Carolina General Assembly has authorized a study of the structure of the regional university system. A report of this study will be made to the legislature. Just what effect this study will have on developments, particularly as it relates to graduate program developments, remains to be seen.

It is our philosophy that approval of graduate programs should not be contemplated without an awareness of employment trends and without considering the discipline. For example, three universities in North Carolina recently indicated interest in developing graduate programs in philosophy. Philosophy programs through the doctoral level now exist at one public institution—the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill—and at one private institution—Duke University. Enrollments in these programs at the two institutions are below capacity.

Investigation by the Board of Higher Education and by an outside consultant revealed that the market for philosophy graduates has gradually declined over the past few years and that this trend will likely continue. The American Philosophical Association listed 935 applicants for 175 openings. Many of the 1969 Ph.D. graduates of such highly regarded departments as that of the University of Michigan received no offers whatsoever. Those within and without the state pointed to an obvious conclusion—which we followed—that no new graduate programs in philosophy should be approved at this time.

It is our further judgment that we must pay greater attention to statistics which clearly point to the oversupply of doctoral graduates. The one exception which seems to me to stand out above all others is the health field. We know no television documentaries are needed to reveal the critical shortage of personnel in medical and allied health services. Surveys throughout the country, particularly surveys in the South, reveal that our needs far outstrip our present capacity to administer to these needs adequately. For this reason, we have put high priority in our state on determining the need for expansion of training programs in the allied health fields.

The Board of Higher Education developed

six considerations to be used in justifying any new graduate degree program. First, the appropriateness of the program for the particular institution. Second, the need for the program, particularly in light of similar or identical programs elsewhere in the state. Third, the feasibility of the program in terms of costs, faculty size and competence, adequacy of space, libraries, equipment, and facilities. Fourth, acceptability of the curriculum and of the standards of admission and graduation. Fifth, possibilities for interinstitutional and intrainstitutional cooperation. Sixth, chances of program accreditation, if this is applicable.

All of us are aware, I think, of the federal government's input into higher education, both public and private. Graduate education has been a beneficiary of this, although it may not have benefited to the extent that some may have desired. But whether or not you feel the federal government should strengthen its financial support of graduate-level education, I believe it should pay more attention to the state coordinating agencies than it has in the past to assist in the orderly development of programs.

Finally, I feel the orderly development of graduate education calls for a much closer scrutiny of existing programs than most state institutions have been willing to undergo. We in North Carolina are presently engaged in an analysis of all degree programs that have consistently graduated only a handful of students, and in some instances, no students at all. Seldom, if ever, have requests for new programs been accompanied by announcements of the discontinuance of unproductive programs even though any development of graduate offerings must take obsolescence into consideration.

# Doctoral Planning for the Seventies: A Challenge to the States

*Lyman A. Glenny, Associate Director, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley*

THE major problems for planning graduate education in the 1970's resulted from an event of the 1950's. That was the launching of Sputnik. The United States reaction to this tremendous achievement of the physical sciences was to reassess our nation's manpower needs for researchers, developers, and teachers. The experts concluded that catching up with the Russians required a massive effort by the universities to gear up for production of scientists. Manpower estimates then predicted a drastic shortage of all kinds of highly trained specialists by the year 1970.

In the 1960's both government and college officials continued to estimate need for greater and greater productivity of the graduate schools. As late as 1968, when the Selective Service threatened to induct graduate students, Gustave O. Arlt, president of the Council of Graduate Schools, indicated that this action would cause production of persons with graduate degrees to fall "far below the needs of government, industry, education and the total social structure."[1]

As late as the spring of 1969, the Rivlin proposal suggested the need to almost double the number of doctoral students to be given federal grants.[2] So did The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.[3] Later in 1969 Congress seriously considered bills supporting these proposals for possible implementation.[4]

These appeals were merely supplemental to the existing myriad of federal programs to support graduate work. The National Science Foundation, the Council of Graduate Schools, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and the American Association of Universities, all encouraged a variety of federal aids for graduate work. Aid was provided through special grants for libraries, computers, and buildings; through National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, Atomic Energy Commission, and Pentagon contracts; through grants for the "emerging" colleges; through support for "centers of excellence"; and through supplemental grants to the institution for each federally aided student who enrolled in doctoral-level work.

Most of the hundreds of millions of dollars for advanced work first and foremost helped expand the sciences, both hard and soft. And in the late sixties small sums became available to the social sciences and humanities.

The states, too, did their share. Indeed, the states have always invested the lion's share of funds in all levels of public higher education. Despite this fact, federal aid for "centers of excellence" and for graduate students induced (or seduced) comprehensive state colleges to embark upon advanced graduate work. Federal funds stimulated, but state funds largely underwrote, the numerous new doctoral institutions which came into existence in the 1960's. Some were former teachers colleges, some state colleges, and a few were small universities—perhaps in name only. States such as Florida and New York created "instant universities," *i.e.*, entirely new and pretentiously "full blown." State coordinating and planning boards, aware of the disproportionate funding required of the states, nevertheless were unable to resist the lure of creating a "great university" or a "center of excellence." Presidents and faculties cited the national shortage of doctorates and the exceptional potential of their particular institutions in order to importune and to exert pressure on the planners and legislators. The presidents claimed they could not hire first-rate professors without also offering opportunity to develop graduate programs and "do research."

---

[1] American Council on Education, *Higher Education and National Affairs*, Vol. XVII, No. 11 (March 15, 1968).

[2] U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, *Toward A Long-Range Plan for Federal Financial Support for Higher Education* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1969).

[3] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Repsonsibility for Higher Education* (Hightstown, N. J.: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1968).

[4] Reid-Brademas Bill, Kennedy Bill, etc.

Faculty members, all trained indeed to "do research" (but not to teach), used their mobility resulting from their scarcity to threaten and cajole for higher salaries, lower teaching loads, and more doctoral programs.

For some states the federal seducement was most thorough. One Southern state with limited resources has authorized five doctoral-level institutions in the last 10 years. Another has authorized four and is planning for still more. In contrast, Illinois supports only four doctoral institutions but ranks fifth in the nation in wealth and is one of the nation's largest producers of doctoral degrees.

Five Southern states in 1966-67 were supporting (probably too strong a word) 34 different doctoral institutions—more than all the Midwestern states put together.

While many of the new doctoral institutions offer the degree only in a few disciplines, others are attempting to succeed with a dozen or more. Moreover, the aspirations of those colleges not yet annointed with the doctoral unguent appear undiminished. State colleges across the land still aspire to become universities, even if only a pale image of the great.

National production of doctorates almost tripled from 1958-1969: from 8,942 to 25,734.[5] By 1976-77 the U. S. Office of Education estimates that 38,700 will be produced per year—about 13,000 more than in 1969. Allan Cartter, chancellor of New York University, estimates that the annual doctoral capacity of the institutions currently authorized to offer degrees will be between 40,000 and 50,000 by 1976.[6]

These numbers signify the tremendous achievement of the combined efforts of federal and state government when seeking a common objective. When working conjointly, the two levels of government can indeed accomplish miracles.

If miracles have been performed, what then is the problem? A few additional figures will begin to reveal it.

Just a few months after Congress began serious consideration of the proposals to provide grants to double the number of doctoral students, it became apparent that some miscalculations had occurred. In the fall of 1969, reports were being circulated that only half of the new doctorates in physics produced the previous year were employed and that newly hatched but unemployed doctorate holders literally besieged the members of the Modern Language Assocation and the American Historical Association at their annual meetings. They wanted jobs.

Malcolm Scully reported in the June 8, 1970, edition of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* that many Ph.D.'s were accepting temporary positions and that the College Placement Council showed a 40 percent decline in offers from business and industry. It appears that we have a surplus of doctorates in many fields—a surplus which threatens to grow larger and to cover almost all fields in the next year or so. If current trends continue, in another five years the surpluses will be great.[7]

If these are the trends, how, one may reasonably ask, did we go wrong? Why didn't someone make more accurate estimates of need and projections of output? Who is to blame for misleading us? The National Science Foundation was as far off as the U. S. Office of Education, the state planners, and the college and university associations. But we did have warning that the estimates of need were exaggerated. Allan Cartter warned the country back in 1964 of the potential for overproduction. He continued his warnings while vice president of the American Council on Education and again in March of this year at the annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education in Chicago.

But who listened? Only a few people around the country—and most of them slowly and reluctantly. (Not until 1967 did the National Science Foundation become a partial believer.) Most presidents and faculty members did not want to believe. They wanted prestige, a university not a state college, an opportunity to be in the big time. The larger prestigious universities, even if they accepted the idea that overproduction might occur, nevertheless were reluctant to cut off federal and state funds by calling attention to it or by offering more than token opposition to the authorization of additional doctoral institutions.

In 1964, Cartter suggested that the then

---

[5] U. S. Office of Education, *Projections of Educational Statistics to 1976-77* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 114, and
American Association for Higher Education, *College and University Bulletin*, Vol. 22, No. 13 (May 15, 1970).

[6] Letter to author dated April 3, 1970.

[7] This paper is limited to doctoral production in the liberal arts and sciences. It does not deal with doctoral training in the professional fields. Some professional fields have a current surplus (engineering); others show severe shortages (medical and health-related fields).

existing shortages would continue only through the late 1960's and that in the early 1970's surpluses would occur. From the evidence he seems to be right. What does he now say about the future?

He and a colleague, Robert Farrell, submitted a paper to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress in 1969. Their estimate of degree production indicated that in 1980 there will be 24,550 new doctorates available for teaching but only 11,600 vacancies, even if we improve the student-faculty ratio by one percent a year.[8] In a recent letter to the author, Dr. Cartter reduced his projection. He stated: "If I had to guess today, I would project Ph.D.'s beyond 1971-72 at a two to three percent rate of growth instead of the four to six percent rate shown in Table III" (from which the above projections were taken).[9] He also estimates that the proportion of doctorates produced which go into teaching will drop from the roughly 50 percent which has prevailed for many years down to 20 or 30 percent by 1980. Thus, even with the reduced figures which he suggests, the excess of doctorates over established need will be substantial. All those not teaching must be absorbed in business and government even if it means taking jobs requiring less training than a Ph.D. degree.

Other sources which project future needs continue to disagree with Cartter. The U. S. Office of Education projects need for a total of 522,000 teachers in 1975. Cartter estimates 368,000 or a 154,000 difference. In March of this year Paul Larkin (a graduate student at George Washington University and senior research associate for the National Planning Association) expressed the need for 438,000 teachers in 1975—70,000 more than Cartter.[10] Of all these numbers about 44 percent would be doctorate holders. Larkin indicates that if we give high national priority to a number of other pressing national goals, there would be no surplus of doctorates. That, of course, is the difficulty in predicting the future. All future estimates are built on a little experience, many assumptions, and much speculation about events and priorities. What current events have implications for planning for future doctorate production?

First and most important, the federal government has apparently read, digested, and believed the Cartter-Farrell projections made in 1969. That paper came at the time President Nixon was looking for ways to balance the budget. Drastic cuts were made in the research budgets of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Defense, and the other agencies having large research contracts with the universities. Substantial redirections were made in aids to graduate students and accompanying grants to institutions. Grants for centers of excellence, libraries, computers, and buildings began to be phased down or out. President Nixon's Higher Education Opportunity Act of 1970 allows for no new financial assistance to graduate students.[11] From its previous position of stimulation and heavy subsidy, the federal government is moving back to the free market system on graduate education.

The consequences to institutions and to the states are already severely felt. During the 1960's some of our greatest universities, both public and nonpublic, had become highly dependent on federal subsidies for their operating costs. With substantially lesser sums available this year, the nonpublic universities are running up large deficits. Next year will be even worse. Harvard and Yale have found it necessary to cut substantially their graduate enrollments. The public universities have turned to the state governments for funds to offset federal losses. They find the states reluctant to approve normal increases in funding, much less vast new amounts. Yet many of the institutions are geared up for the new high level of graduate production. Professors with tenure are on payrolls, expensive hardware is in place, and specially designed buildings are constructed. While the proportion of seniors going on to graduate school in some prestigious universities has dropped in the past two years, the proportions in the emerging state universities are increasing and may continue to do so until undergraduate enrollments level off in the late 1970's.

---

[8] Allan M. Cartter and Robert Farrell, "Academic Labor Market Projections and the Draft," in *The Economics and Financing of Higher Education in the United States: A Compendium of Papers Submitted to the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), Table III, p. 365.

[9] Letter to author dated April 3, 1970.

[10] U. S. Office of Education, *Projections of Educational Statistics to 1976-77* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 59;
Cartter and Farrell, "Academic Labor Market," p. 363;
Paul G. Larkin, "The Challenge to Higher Education of National Manpower Priorities," *Journal of Higher Education* (March, 1970), p. 202.

[11] House of Representatives Bill 16621, sponsored by Representative Albert H. Quie.

Moreover, the demands of the newly authorized doctoral institutions for additional new programs continue unabated. So do the requests of state colleges for initial authority to offer advanced degrees. All wish to round out partially developed programs and to meet the continued demand of students, now augmented by the demands of minority groups.

Should the state governments follow the lead of the national government in abandoning graduate education? Such action would be disastrous to the future well-being of the nation in both social and economic terms. The very bright, the very talented must be educated in order to provide that stimulus to creativity on which an expanding and socially conscious society so much depends. Surpluses are far more desirable than shortages. Because of this, a monumental planning problem confronts every state as we look forward to a moderately expanding need for doctoral degree holders as opposed to the great expansions of the recent past. What are the specific problems and what should be done about them?

Without dwelling on a myriad of minor issues, I see five grave problems facing the public (as well as nonpublic) institutions and the states: (1) underwriting the cost, (2) reducing anticipated surplus production, (3) maintaining the quality of the degree, (4) changing the character of some doctoral degree training, and (5) the absorbing of surplus doctorate holders. All of these problems are closely interrelated.

### Costs

With the federal government withdrawing its financial support of graduate education, the states and their citizens are asked to bear an even greater proportion of the costs. Can and will the states provide adequate support? Should they? Or should undergraduate education be improved? Graduate costs are high. A recent estimate by the National Science Foundation placed total graduate education costs for the nation in 1970 in excess of undergraduate expenditures.[12] Yet the ratio of undergraduate to graduate enrollment is 10-1. Really sound unit costs in graduate education are difficult to find. Estimates range from an average annual cost per student for doctoral work from $3,000 to $10,000 for operations alone. Cartter recently estimated $4,090 for the humanities, $5,320 for social sciences, and $7,040 for the sciences.[13]

The Illinois unit cost study is one of the most thorough and comprehensive in the nation. For the year 1967-68 the study revealed that unit costs per year for the state universities were $2,528 in the humanities, $3,840 for the social sciences, and $5,440 in physical science. These figures represent the weighted averages of all the institutions. The highest figures found were more than double the weighted average and are characteristic of the newer programs.[14]

By multiplying these figures by the number of years the average student takes to get the doctorate, one can estimate the cost for each of those who graduate. Additional costs are accrued by those who enter a program but drop out before receiving a degree. Allowing for the attrition factor, Cartter states that the average cost of a science degree is $62,000.[15] One last observation further compounds the cost problem. The Office of Analytical Studies at the University of California found that it costs more to produce a doctorate in the humanities than in physics, although the annual cost per student is much less in the humanities. This outcome resulted from the higher attrition rate and the greater number of years required to complete the humanities doctorates.[16]

As a means of reducing the unit cost of a degree some institutions are forcing students to complete their work in fewer years, using greater care in admissions in order to lessen the attrition rate and encouraging much more individual self-help and much less course work.

The cost of advanced graduate education will nonetheless remain high. The state and the institutions must ask themselves this question: "In a period of oversupply of doctorates and a short supply of money, what is the marginal utility of investing in another doctoral degree rather than investing the same money in some other level of education?" The answer to that question will vary from state to state and college

---

[12] Ann Heiss cites this estimate in her study, *Doctoral Education in Prestigious Universities*, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. (In press.)

[13] Allan M. Cartter, "Reflections on the Cost of Graduate Education" (paper presented at the Woods Hole Conference on the Future of Graduate Education, Woods Hole, Mass., August, 1969), Table I, adjusted.

[14] Illinois Board of Higher Education, *1967-68 Unit Cost Study Data*, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

[15] Cartter, "Reflections," p. 9.

[16] Information furnished by John Keller, director, Analytical Studies, Office of the Vice President—Planning and Analysis, University of California.

to college, depending on the condition of higher education: its accessibility, its scope, and its quality. For example, if the state's college-going rate is low, it may be more prudent to provide for additional students at the two- or four-year level than to invest in an additional doctoral degree—especially if the quality of the doctoral program is less than excellent. Or perhaps it may be necessary to improve the quality or scope of undergraduate education. Institutions and states must set new priorities between doctoral and undergraduate education and public service.

Determining the actual unit cost of a degree by field of study and level of student is possible now for every institution and every state system. The Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education will also make these costs comparable across state lines, if institutions adopt its model Management Information System now being field tested in several states. Such unit costs will be of great aid to planners and political leaders in making decisions on redirection and investment.

### Reduction in Output

Costs are the primary reason for considering a reduction in doctorate output. Some of that reduction may come about without planning, but careful state planning for its system of institutions must prevail if real savings are to occur.

All projections of doctoral degrees assume that current trends will be only slightly modified for the future. As previously noted, Chancellor Cartter has already modified downward his projection of 1969, primarily because of the fall-off in the rate of entry to graduate education at some Ivy League schools. Other institutions, including some of the large state universities, are also experiencing some leveling off. Beyond this, some big public universities have fewer freshman students applying than last year.[17] It is not beyond reason to assume that the market itself will quickly adjust to demand. Certainly some graduate students in surplus fields, or those about to enter graduate work, will be rethinking the utility of more years of foregone income and the expense of graduate school against immediate employment with a bachelor's or master's degree. Shifts are bound to occur in students' desire to enter training for the doctorate.

Further, if the draft becomes less of a threat (and already it appears to be so), some students will abandon graduate school as a means for delaying or avoiding the draft. Perhaps this shift in thinking accounts in part for the reported drop in graduate enrollments at Ivy League institutions.

Working against these trends toward reduction will be two others. First, minority students, long denied graduate education in any large numbers, will be increasing their enrollment. How much is difficult to estimate. If one uses the percentage increase in enrollment which would occur if minority high school graduates were enrolled in the same proportion as whites, the increase last year would have been two and one-half percent at the freshman level.[18] In future years, as high school graduation rates improve for minorities, the numbers will certainly increase, but what the effects will be on advanced graduate levels would be sheer guesswork today.

The second counter-reduction trend results from three factors: 1) the intense proselyting by institutions which have started new doctoral programs but have not yet obtained sufficient enrollments to justify their continued operation, 2) the effort to increase the number of new doctoral programs by these same institutions, and 3) the thrust of still other colleges to obtain initial authorization to offer them. These three factors will compel the states to improve their system of master planning for doctoral-degree production.

Both undergraduate and graduate enrollments are increasing rapidly in the emerging state schools, partly as a result of the lower costs to the student, partly because of easy access, and partly because the admission and retention standards are lower than in the high-quality graduate schools. Because of the different kind of training, many of the graduates of these new programs will no doubt fill different types of positions in the society than would the graduates of the highly theoretically oriented programs of the prestigious schools.

Nevertheless, the latest figures available as reported by Ann Heiss are that 50 institutions in the country produce 90 percent of all doctorates, and the remaining 10 percent are produced

[17] Office of Institutional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, *For Your Information*, Circular No. 151 (May 3, 1970).

[18] Allan M. Cartter, "The Aftereffects of Putting the Blind Eye to the Telescope" (paper presented at the 25th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March 3, 1970).

by all the other 190 doctoral institutions.[19] One might conclude that all 190 of the "other" universities should close out their programs, thus saving a great deal of money and simultaneously reducing doctorate production by 10 percent. However, some of these schools have sufficiently well-founded programs so that it would be unwise to eliminate them. Be aware that the increased production from these 190 institutions is included in the various projections previously cited. By 1980 their proportion would exceed the 10 percent of current production. Eliminating all these programs would be too drastic a step.

All the same, many doctoral programs should be wiped out and all but a few of the 190 institutions should refrain from starting many additional degree programs. Indeed, perhaps no institution should start a new program unless it is highly innovative, fully interdisciplinary, or in a discipline of national shortage.

Programs that may well be eliminated are those which have not or will not reach optimum enrollments before 1974 or 1975. If they have not done so by then, they are unlikely to thereafter. Other programs for elimination may be those which are few in number in an institution and are in fields already showing large surpluses.

Elimination of a program has traumatic effects. The institution and its faculties have worked long difficult hours in planning and getting the programs under way, even on a limited scale. Too, they have probably spent years in obtaining staff and resources and in getting authorization to offer a doctorate. No school will really want to give up a program, although an objective view of it might dictate otherwise.

For purely economic reasons Tulane University has recently given up eight doctoral programs, and other nonpublic institutions will no doubt be forced to make significant reductions. For most public institutions the statewide coordinating board must assume the task of indicating what should be continued, eliminated, or reduced. It will not be an easy task. Legislatures and governors will need to give them support on carefully conceived recommendations.

For two geographic areas of the nation still another alternative is a possibility and should be explored much more thoroughly than in the past. In the Southern states and in the Western Plains states interstate arrangements could be made to establish a few first-rate, graduate-research-teaching centers. Some may specialize in the sciences, others in the social sciences and/or the humanities. Both regions have too many poor-quality programs in existence now. Both have a number of institutions which ought never to have been authorized to offer advanced degrees. Both regions have the mechanism for planning and for facilitating the kinds of development which Ann Heiss recommends in her study:

> To this end, graduate schools and/or departments should consider the organization and development of consortiums, cluster university programming, reciprocal instructional experiences and, on a cooperative basis, the use of facilities that might be available in other types of institutions or agencies.[20]

The very least that should be done in most of the states in these two regions, given their wealth and resources, is to reduce the number of public institutions which offer the doctorate to one or two per state.[21] Some additional reasons for this are offered in the following section of this paper on the maintenance of quality of graduate degrees.

Beyond the elimination of certain programs cited previously, it may be well for some of the larger state universities to follow the lead of Harvard and Yale, which, for financial reasons, reduced their graduate enrollments; or using Tulane as a model, eliminate some of the less essential high-cost programs. Again, state coordinating agencies have responsibility to encourage such reassessments. Indeed the statewide boards would be well advised to reexamine all of graduate education in their states (both public and nonpublic offerings) with the clear intent of planning in a comprehensive manner for the total state system. Better rationality can be achieved both in relating need to production and production to cost effectiveness.

### Maintaining Quality of the Doctorate

Not only has the current proliferation of doctoral programs and doctoral institutions significantly increased the cost of higher education, it has also encouraged a substantial negative influence on quality. Very few of the

---

[19] Heiss, *op. cit.*

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] Possible exceptions would be Texas and Florida. However, both of these states are presently overextended and should reduce the number.

newly authorized programs across the nation are being financed at levels which are at the average of the top 50 institutions, much less sufficient to lay solid foundations in libraries, equipment, buildings, and faculty. Most of the newly born are struggling for life by sucking the blood out of the undergraduate programs. Let me illustrate: In the South the per-student support for all degree levels was $1,007 in 1967-68, a 21.3 percent increase over 1962-63. Nationally it was $1,116—23 percent more than it had been five years earlier.[22] Yet the Southern states, with proportionately fewer and fewer dollars per student, had increased graduate enrollments 94 percent in this five-year period against a national increase of 74 percent. Doctoral production increased 123 percent in the South and only 80 percent nationally.[23] In other words, with proportionately less and less money per student, at the end of the five-year period the South had expanded graduate education at a rate 27 percent greater than the nation, and doctorates 40 percent greater.[24]

Is it any wonder, then, that the South has 60 institutions offering the doctorate but only eight of them are rated in A, B, C classifications of quality?[25]

The forthcoming report of the American Council on Education, ranking the various graduate schools (having a total of 2,632 departments), will show that all the Southern institutions combined have fewer than a half-dozen "distinguished" departments, and in several disciplines the highest rating is "good."[26]

The Southern states as a whole offer a clearcut case (which is repeated in other regions) in which aspirations of faculty and administrators and political logrolling in the legislatures have created many low-quality doctoral programs while also impairing the quality of undergraduate education. How can the students in these states compete in a national labor market? What will be the character of the educated man in such states as compared to the remainder of the nation? As a result, what will be the long-run impact on politics, government, public service, and industry?

In all states which have limited financial resources, it would seem sensible to bring undergraduate educational levels up to or beyond national norms rather than to increase the amount of graduate education. Unlike high school graduates or those holding bachelor's degrees, for whom local markets absorb the majority, doctoral degree holders are in a national market unconfined by state boundaries. States which have limited resources should not out of false pride try to compete with the well-to-do states in the numbers of doctoral students produced, but rather hire the necessary graduate degree holders in the open market. That market will be plentifully supplied during the next decade and beyond. This also means that those unfortunates who do earn doctorates at second- or third-rate graduate schools will find little or no demand for their services in a glutted market. Why then should the states, which have serious need to improve the quality of the common schools and undergraduate education, expend large sums of money on the production of poor-quality doctorates?

Ann Heiss found that a major element in achieving high-quality doctoral education was the concept of a "critical mass"—of students, faculty, library, and financial resources. She writes that one researcher:

> . . . investigated the question of critical mass as related to departmental size and found that even among the three smallest departments which ranked in the top 25 in his sample, the English departments averaged 25 faculty members, 106 graduate students, and nine Ph.D. awards per year; the three smallest departments of classics averaged seven faculty, 14 students, and one Ph.D. award yearly; and the three smallest physics departments averaged 27 faculty members, 126 students, and 13 Ph.D.'s annually.[27]

The critical mass will be difficult to achieve in most of the newly authorized programs. The marginal student, when he becomes aware of the oversupply of Ph.D.'s, will be wary of undertaking work beyond the master's. The highest ability students who go on will be attracted, as they are now, to the better graduate schools, leaving the remaining students for the

---

[22] Southern Regional Education Board, *Fact Book on Higher Education in the South, 1968* (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1968), p. 51.

[23] Southern Regional Education Board, "Backgound Statistics for the Southern States" (updated tables prepared by SREB for its annual meeting, June, 1970).

[24] SREB, *Fact Book, 1968*, p. 51.

[25] National Science Board, National Science Foundation, *Graduate Education: Parameters for Public Policy* (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 114.

[26] Information supplied informally by Dr. Kenneth Roose, vice president of the American Council on Education.

[27] Heiss, *op. cit.*

190 or so institutions with the smallest and poorest capacity to produce quality work. Moreover, because of the small enrollments, many of these programs may have unit costs which exceed those in the better institutions.

While the leaders of the institutions and the state coordinating boards bear heavy responsibility for the lower quality of the doctoral degree, most derelict are those regional accrediting associations formed for the very purpose of reigning over the quality of education. Accreditation agencies, too, need to review their criteria and to find persons capable of applying them in the new complex setting of higher education.

The watchwords for the 1970's should be: "Limit the number of doctoral programs and improve the quality."

### Character of the Doctoral Degree

Part of the high cost of doctoral education is not reflected in dollars but rather in the inappropriateness of the training which the graduate receives for the kind of work he is destined to perform. Historically, about half of the doctorate holders produced have gone back into higher education. Many of these have located in graduate schools in order to replicate themselves and to do research. Many others, most in fact, have joined institutions which provide the bulk of undergraduate education. There, research is tolerated but not venerated. Teaching is the number one, and perhaps the only, major chore. Yet the doctorate holder has not been trained to teach. He has been trained to do research and to do so in some narrowly defined field. For many years now, foresighted scholars and planners have been concerned at the lack of a teaching doctorate. Just 10 years ago Earl McGrath, the former federal commissioner of education, wrote articles and spoke often about the need of a college teaching profession with members having appropriate teacher-training degrees.[28]

As we look toward the next decade, it would be tragic, if not disastrous, for the surplus products of our research-oriented graduate schools to end up teaching in the junior and community colleges as Mr. Larkin, the National Research Council, and the National Science Foundation would have them do.[29] These are institutions which require the highest caliber of teaching, attracting as they do students with a very wide range of interests and abilities. The open-door, four-year colleges are just as vulnerable. As one scholar recently wrote, "Ph.D. training is irrelevant to the realities of most classrooms."[30] In order to prevent this unfortunate outcome, the graduate schools need to adopt new requirements for some Ph.D.'s or provide a new doctoral degree with emphasis on teaching. The pressure for this change is mounting.

At the last annual meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the guest speakers urged the state colleges not to emphasize graduate education and research but rather, as Paul Woodring stated, ". . . show some imagination" and "become distinctive, first-rate universities of a new kind."[31] E. Alden Dunham, who recently completed a study of the state college, charged their chief administrators to "strike off in new directions . . . or follow in the weary footsteps of the institutions that are in the most trouble."[32] Dunham went on to urge the creation of a special teaching degree for undergraduate education. In December 1969, the Council of Graduate Schools was urged to do the same thing by Dean Michael Brenan of Brown University.[33] At the same meeting the Council, in principle, "recommended the establishment of graduate programs leading to the degree Doctor of Arts to prepare graduate students for a lifetime of effective teaching at the college level."[34]

If Allan Cartter's estimate is correct that 20 to 30 percent of the doctorates will enter college teaching, then about a fourth of all doctorates produced might be trained to teach. Unless teaching as a profession as well as research becomes an accepted and honored mode of life for the doctorate holder, and he is rewarded

---

[28] See, for example, his remarks in "Graduate Training for College Teaching," *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Autumn, 1960), pp. 294 ff.

[29] Larkin, *op. cit.*, p. 202.

[30] E. Alden Dunham, "Rx for Higher Education: Doctor of Arts Degree" (report presented at the 25th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March, 1970).

[31] As reported in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. IV, No. 9 (November 24, 1969).

[32] Dunham, *op. cit.* See also his book, *Colleges of the Forgotten Americans* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969).

[33] *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Vol. IV, No. 11 (December 8, 1969).

[34] Letter dated March 5, 1970, from Alvin H. Proctor (then chairman of the Council of Graduate Schools) to Winfred L. Godwin, president, Southern Regional Education Board, with enclosure.

appropriately, it seems improbable that undergraduate education will be improved and even probable that junior college education will be impaired.

The narrowness of doctoral training limits the potential usefulness of the degree not only for teaching but also for many other fields of endeavor. The National Science Foundation has become increasingly concerned, especially as the number of degree holders began to exceed new positions in the traditional fields. The most recent report states:

> It is therefore very important that new Ph.D.'s be offered options of graduate programs including some that are most suitable for these new activities. Furthermore, students must not be educated with "false" aspirations for solely research careers. This training issue will make it necessary for universities to examine their graduate programs and probably to develop different and new programs for Ph.D.'s who do not intend to enter research careers.[35]

Thus a redirection in emphasis of much of graduate education is as essential as control of numbers and quality. Both the distinguished institutions and those "emerging" universities must now reassess the role of doctoral education in the 1970's and beyond.

### Absorbing the Surplus Doctorates

Some persons making observations on the coming decade, as did Mr. Larkin and the National Science Foundation cited previously, refuse to believe that a real surplus of doctorates is in the making. Rather, they take the view that we can never overeducate our people and that junior colleges and other social agencies previously prevented from hiring doctorates because of their scarcity will have available to them these highly trained specialists. Ecology, racism, housing, transportation, and poverty are cited as possible problems which will absorb these high talents and training. The National Science Foundation reports that ". . . Ph.D.'s are likely to be engaged in activities which are markedly different from those practiced by most present doctorate holders."[36]

We do not know the exact problems on which doctorate holders will work, but all surpluses will be absorbed nevertheless. People with doctorates must also eat and thus work. So it seems probable that they may indeed take positions for which we would now consider them overtrained. Many doctorates are perhaps already in such positions. Dean John Miller of the Yale Graduate School recently stated that at a recent conference of industrial laboratory administrators it became clear that "now that the draft laws had been changed, bachelors in physics were available, and since the price of a Ph.D. was $15,000, the industrialists would rather hire the B.A."[37] He went on to say that "some doctorates, even before the present softness, were finding themselves jobs which called for talents much less than those they had."[38]

The question, then, is not one of outright unemployment for the surplus doctorates, but rather whether it is more desirable public policy to provide overtraining for some persons while allowing a smaller than necessary portion of public resources to go for other social problems, perhaps including an improvement in undergraduate education.

In avoiding an overreaction to surpluses on the one hand, we must keep in mind that some of the current voices advising us that "all is well for the decade if we just leave things alone," are also the same voices which during the 1960's misled us into thinking we would continue to have serious shortages of doctorates in the decade of the 1970's.

On the other hand, it would be foolhardy to take the position that drastic cutbacks should be made in doctoral production across the land. Rather, the need is for a careful assessment of basic needs and a careful allocation of resources to meet them. Modest adjustments of the kind recommended in this paper are in order in many states. Institutional governing boards, statewide coordinating boards, as well as governors and legislators, must take a long-range view—at minimum 10 to 15 years. It took about 10 years of massive effort to gear up the graduate schools to meet 1969 needs. Now it would be unwise to make such dramatic reductions in graduate opportunities as to place ourselves in the 1980's in the same jeopardy as we found ourselves in the 1960's.

---

[35] National Science Foundation, *Science and Engineering Doctorate Supply and Utilization*, 1968-1980, NSF 69-37 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 3.

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[37] Comment from preliminary transcript of conference proceedings, "Measuring Outputs in Higher Education," sponsored by Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, and American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., May 3-5, 1970.

[38] *Ibid.*

The governor and legislature of each state has the final responsibility for public policy. In 48 of the 50 states, statewide coordinating boards have been authorized to aid them in the orderly development of higher education. One of their great challenges for the seventies will be their ability to make thoughtful recommendations on the role of the individual institutions in providing high-quality doctoral education. Those institutional roles within a system of education must be more carefully appraised than in the past decade.

# The Care and Nurture of Teaching Scholars

*Alvin H. Proctor, Academic Vice President, Kansas State College of Pittsburg*

THE assignment which Dr. Godwin gave me was to comment on Dr. Glenny's paper with particular reference to "the matter of the state colleges and regional state university and graduate education, including the D.A. (Doctor of Arts degree)." He suggested that there might be other matters on which I would also like to comment and there are. All of my comments, however, will focus on the matter of the necessity for better teaching in the universities and undergraduate colleges of America. The focus will be primarily on the undergraduate colleges and regional universities, with the implication, of course, that better teaching is perhaps equally needed in the graduate schools.

Dr. Glenny's excellent statement dealt with several of the serious problems which confront graduate education in the United States. The essence of my comments focuses upon the "character of the doctoral degree" and reflects the concern of various national organizations [1] as well as a large number of universities and colleges with the function and quality of doctoral graduate study. In order to so comment, may I repeat certain cogent statements in his paper as follows:

> The watchwords for the 1970's should be: "Limit the numbers of programs and improve the quality."
>
> It appears that we have a surplus of doctorates in many fields—a surplus which threatens to grow larger and to cover almost all fields in the next year or so.
>
> What current events have implications for planning for future doctoral production?
>
> A fourth grave problem is changing the character of some doctoral training.
>
> Most of the newly born (institutions at graduate levels) are struggling for life by sucking the blood out of the undergraduate programs.

American democratic society can thrive, and perhaps will only be able to survive, if its citizens are democratically efficient. That is, its citizens must be alert to the nature and significance of its vast problems; informed with sufficient factual data and not merely "news"; skilled in the processes of rational decision making; and motivated and willing to live by a viable set of democratic values. This means of course that, in one way or another, they must be well educated. Although there are many instruments for education in the modern world, the primary one has been the public elementary and high schools and more and more the colleges and universities of America.

One could further simplify these premises and their implications by asserting that, in a nation and world whose primary characteristic is that of accelerating change, our citizens will be effective in solving the problems which they face only if they have been well taught. This kind of teaching was pungently described by Dean John Perry Miller of Yale when he wrote recently:

> The purpose of a liberal education is not simply to impart knowledge or to develop competence, although these are important by-products. It is rather to develop a capacity to cope with various kinds of knowledge—to define a problem, analyze it, seek out the relevant factual information for its understanding and, if need be, to place it in its historical, philosophical and ethical perspectives.
>
> . . . the essence of such an education lies not in "what one knows" (the most educated among us knows so little) but "how one knows" . . . We must, then, teach individual men to cope with their everlasting ignorance. It is not what a man knows that will count, but whether he knows how to extract from the "knowledge bank" what is relevant to his purposes and how to use this knowledge in a discriminating and constructive way.[2]

And yet, although the necessity of good teaching has long been recognized as the hallmark and main duty of elementary and high

---

[1] Published statements are voluminous by such organizations as the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the National Science Foundation, the learned organizations, and many monographs.

[2] John Perry Miller, "The Liberal Arts: A Time of Challenge and Opportunity," *Ventures*, VIII, No. 2 (Fall, 1968), pp. 2-3.

school teachers, it is only very recently that high-quality college teaching has begun to receive the responsible attention that it deserves from the institutions of higher education.

The neglect of college teaching and its inferior status on many campuses is so evident that the authors of a recent book *Learning and the Professors* asserted in their introduction: "Here lies the central problem: College teaching is probably the only profession in the world for which no specific training is required. The profession of scholarship is rich in prerequisites for entry, but not that of instruction."[3]

The authors of another study, *The Importance of Teaching*, said in their introduction:

> The need to emphasize the importance of teaching in the colleges and universities . . . is acute because our society requires, as never before, a broad infusion of well-educated minds. It requires also, greater number of students sufficiently motivated to devote their careers to advancing the academic disciplines and the practical expression of these disciplines through teaching and the other professions. The need is made more acute by the low priority given to teaching at present in too many colleges and universities as compared with other claims upon the professor's time. The opportunity to improve teaching is at least as great as the need for it.[4]

In a recent study of higher education, Paul Woodring states in a chapter on "Who Will Teach the Undergraduates?" that "the undergraduate is becoming the forgotten man of American higher education."[5] He refers to the indifference if not contempt that new, young faculty members entering the state colleges have for preparation for teaching[6] and then points out that "graduates of prestige colleges do not necessarily get the best teachers, for a professor need not be a great teacher or even a good teacher to survive in a college in which all the students are both academically talented and highly motivated."[7] In short, there is not overwhelming evidence that the prestigious, highly selective institutions do indeed have the best, or even enough, high-quality teaching scholars, although evidence may indicate that they have more than enough research specialists and a faculty that has published and not perished.

The point is that *teaching scholars* and *teaching scholarship* need and require significant and careful attention from most universities and colleges. Their duty to give responsible attention is inherent in the nature and mission of the institutions and is the obvious professional responsibility of their faculties.

The need to do something about college teaching is explicit because of other factors: rising enrollment in the traditional and established undergraduate colleges; the accelerating growth of graduate schools with a subsequent drain-off of available Ph.D.'s and professional doctorates in many disciplines, leaving the undergraduate schools with a decreasing supply of doctoral faculty members; increasing evidence that research specialists are neither intentionally and frequently not even accidentally good teachers, as sometimes indicated by widespread undergraduate student unrest and rebellion; the rapid growth of the two-year colleges (community and junior colleges) which now enroll over two million students and whose growth rate indicates a need for 100,000 new lower-division undergraduate teachers by 1975. Finally, the explosion of new knowledge, coinciding with the rapid advance of new technology for teaching individuals as well as mass classes, makes attention to better college teaching inevitable and imperative.

Fortunately for the nation and for higher education, the better preparation of college teachers is moving rapidly out of the lonely and heretofore exclusive domain of professional education into the whole academic arena in many colleges and universities. The preparation of college teachers and the importance of good teachers per se now engage the attention of major universities and colleges, graduate organizations, learned organizations, scientific faculties, and groups representing the burgeoning junior colleges.

For example, a Select Committee on Education of the Academic Senate at Berkeley asserted in its *Report:*

> One of the most widely accepted ideas in modern thinking about college teaching is that the quality of teaching depends on the ethos of the campus; *it matters profoundly whether a campus is or is not permeated with care for teaching* [italics mine].

---

[3] Ohmer Milton and E. S. Shoben, Jr., eds., *Learning and the Professors* (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1968), xvii.

[4] The Committee on Undergraduate Teaching, *The Importance of Teaching, A Memorandum to the New College Teacher* (New Haven, Conn.: The Hazen Foundation, 1968), p. 9.

[5] Paul Woodring, *The Higher Learning in America: A Reassessment* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), p. 185.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 28.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

> A class taught by an unprepared teacher teaches the student neglect of scholarship. A department which encourages professors to hide from students teaches the neglect of human relations. . . . Each of us has a stake, then, in the good teaching of the others, and the good teaching of each is the legitimate concern of all. A campus that lacks a tradition of good teaching by that fact casts some doubt on the ultimate meaning of its scholarship.[8]

A large number of faculty members in a considerable number of colleges and universities have long believed this, but no organized, systematic attention on a significant scale has really been evident.

It seems to me that there can be no really serious disagreement with the obvious need to improve current university and college undergraduate and graduate teaching scholarship. It is equally obvious that Dr. Glenny accurately points an academic finger at the closely related and inseparable questions of current surplus of doctorates; the high unit cost of graduate education which is of mounting concern to us all and which rightfully or not will decide much; and, of course, the painful question as to who should provide doctoral study for research scholars, teaching scholars, and professionals of many kinds. These are serious and unavoidable questions and no doubt you will wish to deal with them in our discussion; however, may I deal momentarily with the question of doctoral education for teaching scholars.

The Council of Graduate Schools in the United States recently formed a Committee on the Preparation of College Teachers of which I am chairman, and we hope that it will before the end of 1970 become a commission which will utilize the best expertise available for its tasks. The committee was directed to "develop guidelines and recommendations relating to suitable programs at the graduate level and was asked to make recommendations with regard to appropriate degrees for those who complete specified programs in preparation for a career in college teaching."

The care and nurture of good college teaching (of teaching scholars) requires several things. It requires the best possible preparation of undergraduate teachers before they begin their teaching careers in order that they can begin with a high level of expertise; and, of course, the regular tenured faculty must provide systematic, planned programs of assistance so that the neophyte will, with expert guidance and advice, continue to improve his techniques and teaching artistry. If administrators and senior faculty can adjust their thinking, painful though it may be, to the needs of the times, such teaching scholars may even achieve the pinnacle of full professorship or a highly paid position, not because of published research but because they are expert career teachers in the classroom. Administrators and trustees who really believe in the value of teaching scholars must devise methods to recognize and reward their teaching faculty commensurate with rewards given to the research specialist.

But what about degree programs for teaching scholars? What about the Ph.D. for such purposes; or, is it true as Alden Dunham has recently said that "every ill besetting our colleges and universities is related in one way or another to the Ph.D. degree" and that "in this new era the Ph.D. degree as the sole model for the preparation of college faculty members is an anachronism,"[9] especially for the preparation of teaching scholars?

What about the Doctor of Arts degree, which has now been established in at least three institutions and, in one stage or another, is now under serious consideration at many more universities, including both the mighty and the lowly among graduate schools?[10]

Several Ph.D. granting institutions are making some effort to inject limited preparation for teaching into what has been until now a degree tailored rather strictly to the development of research scholars and specialists. In the judgment of many, the Candidate in Philosophy "degree" or interim title as a stage in Ph.D. achievement does not deal at all with the germane problem—that of the better preparation of college teachers. However, a growing number of major institutions now award such certificates to indicate the achievement of the "A B D" (all but dissertation) stage toward the Ph.D. degree.

Tinkering with the Ph.D. may, in the opinion of some, damage the highly desirable and main

---

[8] *Education at Berkeley, Report of the Select Committee*, Charles Muscatine, chairman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), pp. 39-40.

[9] E. Alden Dunham, "Rx for Higher Education: Doctor of Arts Degree" (report presented at the 25th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, Ill., March, 1970), pp. 2 and 8.

[10] See the unpublished paper by Robert H. Koenker, dean of the Graduate School, Ball State University (Spring, 1970).

purpose and function of the degree.[11] Nevertheless, several Ph.D. programs now include various devices to improve teaching ability which go beyond mere tinkering. Claremont Graduate School now offers a bona fide and well-funded teaching internship as part of Ph.D. study. Other institutions offer seminars in college teaching and specific attention and tutorial instruction by senior professors for teaching assistants. Emory University offers two distinct Ph.D. programs in history—one for university-oriented students and another for those preparing to teach in four-year liberal arts colleges. Both are well funded, and the point of differentiation is at the dissertation stage. However, experiments with the Ph.D. are still largely undeveloped as far as the specific preparation of better beginning teachers is concerned.

Recently I participated in discussions held by the Rocky Mountain Mathematics Consortium, and, if I interpreted correctly a large body of opinion expressed there, there are many who believe that the Ph.D. can be revised not only to produce research specialists but also to produce by different "tracks" of the same degree well prepared and career-oriented teaching scholars. The difficulties were well presented by Dean Daniel Alpert of the University of Illinois in a recent paper about cross-disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and multidisciplinary research centers and degree programs.[12] The same interest in multitrack Ph.D.'s was expressed at a conference sponsored by Western Michigan University and in a conference at which I was a consultant with the graduate deans of the University of Missouri system.

Changing educational programs, and especially graduate programs, is indeed akin in difficulty to moving a graveyard. We shall have to wait and see, but I do think that a major by-product of interest in the Doctor of Arts is a ferment to revise the Ph.D.

What about the Doctor of Arts for teaching scholars? It is really too early to discern whether the community colleges can attract, can afford, or even prefer a teaching faculty with the doctorate in either the vocational-technical areas or academic subjects. Until now they have not. It is really too early in the decade to predict the success of the Doctor of Arts as the highest graduate degree for teaching scholars.[13] After all, the Doctor of Arts will be designed by graduate school faculties which are traditionally staffed by Ph.D.'s, perhaps working in uneasy partnership with the School of Education. The new doctorate must avoid the pitfalls of mediocrity which can damage its quality and its status if too many graduate schools of lesser quality are the first to adopt it. It must survive the olympian pronouncements of the accrediting agencies, and perhaps even avoid them, before it can successfully get off the ground. Will the market place—the two-year and undergraduate colleges—actually accept the Doctor of Arts as equal in quality with the older degrees and worth paying equally for classroom teaching?

No one knows at this stage of the game, but the main outlines of the Doctor of Arts are beginning to emerge.[14] You can read about them in several recent publications, and because of the lack of time, I should like to summarize the main characteristics of the new degree at this point in time. They are primarily philosophical and are as follows:

1. The Doctorate of Arts must be designed for teaching scholars; the Ph.D. already provides education and training for research specialists, and the professional doctorates meet other needs.

2. The Doctorate of Arts must require not less than three years of graduate study of such rigor that the degree will receive the same status, prestige, and rewards as other respected doctoral degrees.

3. The degree program and the graduate students in it must be under the control of the graduate faculty of the subject-matter field.

---

[11] The Council of Graduate Schools (CGS) takes the position that the Ph.D. degree ". . . is essentially and primarily research oriented: it is and should be the highest research degree." (booklet on *The Doctor of Arts Degree*, March, 1970.) See also, CGS, *The Doctor of Philosophy Degree*, 1964, 1968.

[12] Daniel Alpert, "The Role and Structure of Interdisciplinary and Multidisciplinary Research Centers" (paper given at the Annual Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, Washington, D. C., December, 1969.)

[13] Alvin H. Proctor, "The Appropriate Structures for the Preparation of Community College Teachers" (unpublished paper given at Western Michigan University Conference, April 29, 1970.)

[14] CGS booklet, *The Doctor of Arts Degree;*
American Association of State Colleges and Universities booklet, *The Doctor of Arts Degree. A Proposal for Guidelines* (February, 1970);
E. Alden Dunham, "Suggestions for Doctor of Arts Program" (draft statement, February 25, 1970);
Dean Joseph L. McCarthy of the University of Washington, "The Preparation of College Teachers at the Doctoral Level" (a paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, Chicago, April 6, 1970);
and many others.

This is academically desirable and, given the facts of life about "educational politics" and marketplace prestige, is simple necessity.

4. Because the degree is oriented toward developing teaching competence in a broad subject matter area, course selection will typically be broader within a particular discipline than for the Ph.D. and other degrees and may also bridge several related disciplines. However, the program must be logical and coherent and not fall prey to the "cafeteria" approach of random study.

5. Prospective college teachers will take an appropriate amount of formal course work and seminars in such areas as the psychology of learning and teaching, the history and sociology of the appropriate levels of higher education, and the responsibilities of faculty members within an institutional setting.

6. A structured teaching or other appropriate internship will be required, which will include progressive and responsible classroom experience in regular courses, preferably in more than one kind of course. Obviously, a person who intends to teach in a community college should have an internship experience in such a setting.

7. The program of graduate study should culminate in independent investigation of an area in the subject matter field. Such investigation might take the form of research on teaching problems and may make a contribution to the teaching of the subject matter. The objective will not be to contribute to the frontiers of disciplinary knowledge; it will be to develop the ability of the prospective teacher to evaluate, synthesize, and apply knowledge to teach students more effectively in the classroom.

8. Finally, because graduate study is advanced study, the courses for the prospective teacher must have appropriate research components. As Dean Miller said, every successful teacher and student must "know how to know" and must be able to extract information from a constantly changing knowledge bank that daily grows more complex.

In conclusion may I quote one of Dr. Glenny's colleagues and then add a brief comment of my own. Ann Heiss of the Center at Berkeley wrote in a then unpublished paper:

> Since the cultivation and transmission of knowledge is a primary responsibility of the academic profession, it follows that the quality of education and of life is largely determined in a given society by that society's response to the question: How well are your teachers prepared for teaching? This is not merely to ask: How well have your teachers achieved mastery of the knowledge in their teaching field, and how free are they to teach that knowledge to others, but, how well have they been prepared in the art and skills of teaching it? If we direct this last question to the preparation of college teachers in the United States, we receive some disquieting responses.

One cannot be sure that we will really have a surplus of doctorates unless he is certain that the development of the economy, the extension of the concept of continuing education for millions of adult Americans, and the growth of undergraduate education will slow and be restricted by sheer cost and the unmanageable nature of massive higher education. I am certain that quantitatively and qualitatively we need more really well-prepared teaching scholars.

The task of deciding which institutions will offer doctorates to both research specialists and teaching scholars will try the wisdom of many Solomons—and in the end will be decided on less than purely idealistic bases by down-to-earth politicians, reluctant taxpayers, and administrators and trustees who must deal with both. However, without the gift of prophecy, one can safely assert that in the not too distant future the undergraduate student will not be the forgotten man in higher education—he won't let us forget—and that college teaching will not continue to be the only profession for which no specific training is required.

# A State Senator Replies

*Lamar R. Plunkett, State Senator, Georgia*

DR. Glenny is a brave man. He has come here to tell us in his paper that what we are doing is wrong. It is as simple as that—if I understood him correctly.

He has given us a history of the development of doctoral programs since Sputnik some 16 years ago. In the South we have shared in this development. The input and thrust of the federal government into doctoral programs and into the entire educational program was very much needed in the South—very much felt, and good for us all. We have utilized the funds we have received.

It may be that we have overdone the development of some programs, but I think Dr. Glenny has overstated his case. It seems to me that his conclusions are too sweeping.

I believe, for example, that his paper is a little too critical of some late-blooming institutions. The extreme concentration of graduate education in a relatively small number of "prestige" universities has been a source of national concern for some time. Orderly development of graduate education may well involve cutting back the expansion of certain programs and of certain institutions. It should also mean correcting any unbalanced distribution in programs and the strengthening of institutions in areas of sparse educational development.

I do not believe orderly development should spell "educational colonialism" for the South. We have some catching up to do, and we need truly to be part of the nation in all major areas of attainment, including higher education.

If we have a surplus of programs—he said a surplus is better than scarcity—the persons trained by them are not going to be wasted. The question of a Ph.D. teaching in a junior college, for example, does not worry me as much as it does Dr. Glenny. I think maybe it would be good for the teacher and it would be good for the junior college.

Dr. Glenny mentioned costs and said perhaps there was a way to determine accurately costs of doctoral programs. I am interested in studying this myself because costs are of considerable interest in the Georgia Legislature. In the State of Georgia, about 28 percent of our boys and girls, ages 18 to 21, attend college, while the national average is 40 to 50 percent. There is a dire need to spend money at the college-age level, and we must decide how best to spend the limited amount of available funds.

Our opinion is that every dime we receive in our state could be spent for education. Right now, 58 cents of every dollar that comes into Georgia's treasury goes for education. I am sure education could spend all of it, but, of course, we have additional responsibilities.

Dr. Glenny has mentioned various things we can do and the care required to hold what we have in the meantime. He calls these changes modest, but I think they are pretty drastic.

The legislator reports to the people, and they hold him responsible for the money that is expended. He gets the bill, but it is the coordinating board or the boards of authority within the schools which actually design the programs in the first place. Somehow, the governors, legislators, and coordinating boards must find ways of working together to handle this monumental planning job mentioned by Dr. Glenny. I think it is just that—a monumental planning job. We must start planning for the orderly development of doctoral programs for the next 10 to 15 years, considering at all times how they relate to the rest of higher education in our states and in the nation.

# II. Evaluating the Community Junior College

## Community Colleges: A Friendly Critique

*James L. Wattenbarger, Director, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida*

FEW observers of American life in the 1960's could fail to note the consistent and relatively rapid growth of post–high school education during this decade. This development has been influenced by a number of factors, some of which were described by the famed historian Arnold Toynbee in a wonderful essay entitled, "Higher Education in a Time of Accelerating Change." In this essay Toynbee noted four factors which have been responsible for the increased emphasis upon higher education: (1) the development of experimental science during the 17th century; (2) the coordinate development of science and technology at quantum rates of increases during the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries; (3) the application of science to technology; and (4) the universalization of primary education. To these I would add a fifth: the increasing implementation of the concept which places high value upon the worth and dignity of each human being.

These factors among others have resulted in an increasing pressure upon each person to continue his formal as well as his informal education. Studies have repeatedly emphasized the need for greater educational opportunity at the post–high school level. Certain studies such as those of the President's Commission on Post–High School Education, the Educational Policies Commission, and more currently the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education have emphasized both the need for increased educational opportunity and the relative progress which has been made in meeting this need.

The development of education at the post–high school level has been characterized particularly during the past 20 years by: (1) an especially rapid increase in the numbers of students who want to continue their education, and (2) a concomitantly rapid increase in the diversity of educational opportunity at this level.

If 1948 is used as a base year, one may note that there were less than two and a half million students enrolled in 1,808 institutions of higher education in the United States in the fall of that year. The similar fall statistics for 1968 show that seven and a half million students were enrolled in 2,498 institutions. These figures show a 200 percent increase in enrollment alone during the 20-year period. A more specific analysis of institutional growth, however, shows that a sizeable increase has occurred in the number of students enrolled in the community colleges during this quarter of a century (from 358,000 to almost two million). The increase in the number and size of community colleges is also an indication of the increase in diversity of educational opportunity at the post–high school level, since these institutions serve a more varied group of students than the traditional baccalaureate degree-granting institutions.

The supporters of community junior colleges have claimed that the establishment of these institutions in the various states would eliminate or at least alleviate the barriers which have prevented many youths from continuing their education beyond high school. They have claimed that students would not only enroll in large numbers, but that they would take advantage of the broad curricula benefiting both individuals and society in general.

Early advocates of community colleges such as L. V. Koos stressed the purposes of the community colleges (called junior colleges almost exclusively then) in three major categories:

1. *Those results which pertain to the students.* Some examples of these are: (a) offering the first two years of four-year degree programs; (b) offering the opportunity for continued education to students who will not work for a

baccalaureate degree; (c) providing occupational education at the post–high school level; (d) popularizing higher education; (e) continuing home influences; and (f) offering lifelong educational opportunities readily accessible to a diverse group of students.

2. *Those results which affect all of higher education.* Examples of these results are: (a) relieving pressures upon the lower divisions of the universities so that they may concentrate upon the levels of education which only they can carry out; (b) providing diversity of educational opportunity at this level of education; and (c) increasing the accessibility of higher education for more students.

3. *Those results which influence society in general.* Examples of these are: (a) democratizing education beyond the high school; (b) increasing the relevance of education; (c) improving the economic, social, and cultural life of a community; and (d) providing continued educational opportunity for all age groups.

The Southern Regional Education Board in its statement on goals published in 1961 emphasized five goals:

1. To provide every individual with opportunity for maximum development of his abilities.
2. To produce citizens who are responsive to the social, economic, and political needs of their time.
3. To achieve excellence in teaching, scholarship, and research.
4. To accelerate the economic progress of the Southern region through education and research.
5. To guide the region in solving social problems created by population changes, racial differences, urbanization, and technological growth.

The Commission on Goals urged the states in this region to establish "strong systems of two-year community colleges" as one way to implement the goals described above.

Now in 1970 it would seem appropriate to critique the progress which has been made in accomplishing the stated purposes of these colleges. In order to do this, one might well compare the goals with the accomplishments in order to determine where more progress should be made.

### Results Pertaining to Students

There has been rapid increase in the number of community colleges established in this region during the past 20 years. Florida now has almost completed its statewide plan with 27 of 28 institutions in operation; Georgia has added several new institutions bringing its current total to 13; North Carolina has increased rapidly with almost 50 institutions providing education at this post–high school level; Virginia has created an entirely new state system of community colleges with more than half of the 23 colleges projected in the master plan now in operation; Tennessee has developed rapidly with nine currently authorized community colleges; Alabama has created an entirely new group of community colleges bringing its total to 17; Mississippi, an early advocate of the "people's colleges," has largely expanded the 19 existing institutions; Maryland has developed and strengthened her community colleges with a current total of 13 institutions; Texas community colleges have increased in enrollment as well as in the establishment of six new institutions; the only new public institution of higher education in 50 years in Oklahoma is Tulsa Junior College.

Although growth in community colleges has been either slow or nonexistent in Arkansas, Louisiana, South Carolina, and West Virginia, there has been continuing concern expressed for education at this level, and some alternate ways of providing post–high school education have been considered in every instance. In Table I, one will see that most of the states in the region have experienced a considerable development in education at this level. This table includes technical institutes as well as the comprehensive community colleges, and therefore, in several states, institutions are listed which do not purport to carry out the goals of the community junior college as outlined above. These institutions do carry out a portion, at least, of the assigned objectives and for that reason are included in the table. Specific examples of this are some institutions in North Carolina and all of those in South Carolina.

It is obvious that there must be a great variety of institutions as may be indicated by size and by program in the states in the region. In spite of the growth during the years 1948-1968, the proportion of the United States' total which is represented in this region has increased only slightly during the 20-year period, from 19 percent of the total to 20 percent of the total. The Southern region is keeping abreast of the national trends but is not growing much more rapidly than other sections of the nation.

In Table II, there is pointed up even more specifically the wide differences which currently exist in the opportunities within this region. Florida is the only state in the region which has a larger proportion of its population involved in community junior college educational activities than is true of the nation as a whole. Other states range up to as high as one student in almost 500 persons while Florida's ratio is one in 65 persons. The nation as a whole shows a ratio of one in each 110 persons. Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas are near the national average, but Tennessee is the only high state which is currently in the process of establishing new community colleges.

Although early impetus for community colleges most often originates at local levels, there have been key decisions made in each of the states at the state level. The traditional locally oriented, locally operated, and locally supported community college has been replaced by a great amount of state support and concomitant state coordination. In some instances total state support with the accompanying state operation and control has been the accepted procedure.

Current planning in these same states includes the establishment of community colleges as an essential part of the master plan for the development of higher education. These master plans consider the total educational needs at the post–high school level and develop a way of providing for all of the needs, hopefully in accord with the goals as described earlier by the Southern Regional Education Board.

*Student Enrollment*

The results which were described by early proponents of the community junior college projected an increase in the proportion of the age group who would continue their education if the community colleges were available. There is evidence that specific increases in numbers of students who attend post–high school educational institutions have occurred as the apparent

TABLE I

PUBLIC TWO YEAR COLLEGES IN THE SREB STATES (Including Technical Institutes and Two-Year University Branch Centers), 1948, 1967

| State | Number of Institutions | | Total Fall Enrollment | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 | 1967 | 1948 | 1967 |
| Alabama | 1 | 15 | 695 | 17,540 |
| Arkansas | 5 | 3 | 3,765 | 2,636 |
| Florida | 4 | 27 | 1,233 | 92,691 |
| Georgia | 9 | 12 | 4,604 | 15,610 |
| Kentucky | 2 | 15 | 363 | 9,923 |
| Louisiana | 3 | 4 | 2,294 | 6,617 |
| Maryland | 4 | 13 | 1,238 | 28,224 |
| Mississippi | 14 | 19 | 7,578 | 20,635 |
| North Carolina | 4 | 47 | 1,768 | 38,234 |
| Oklahoma | 18 | 11 | 4,507 | 8,302 |
| South Carolina | 0 | 16 | 0 | 14,846 |
| Tennessee | 1 | 5 | 624 | 6,226 |
| Texas | 36 | 42 | 36,498 | 87,595 |
| Virginia | 3 | 17 | 2,711 | 19,030 |
| West Virginia | 1 | 3 | 1,356 | 2,024 |
| Total | 105 | 259 | 69,234 | 370,133 |
| United States | 337 | 739 | 358,081 | 1,810,964 |

Source: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969 Directory

result of the development of community colleges. A few years ago only one person in four attended college; within the foreseeable future this figure will most likely exceed one in two. In 1967 the ratio between total college-age population and the total undergraduate enrollment is reported as 52.4 percent (*Fact Book on Higher Education in the South, 1968*). This represents a considerable increase over the 1950 figure of 27.3 percent.

The specific effect that community colleges have upon college attendance patterns may be examined by looking at statistics for several states. In the *Fact Book on Higher Education in the South, 1968*, college enrollment patterns for each of the Southern Regional Education Board states were reported and analyzed. For 1967 Florida was reported as enrolling 45.3 percent of its college-age population in college, while Georgia enrolled 29.0 percent. In Florida 44.1 percent of the total college enrollment was in community colleges, while in Georgia only 11 percent was in community colleges. A cause and effect relationship might be assumed.

Although several other states report ratios of college attendance equally as high as Florida's (*e.g.*, Texas and Maryland) none has increased as rapidly since 1960 as has Florida, and none has as high a proportion of community college students as Florida (see Table II). There appears to be evidence herein to indicate that the development of community colleges has increased in great measure the college attendance patterns in that state.

Other studies also support this position: Bashaw (Bashaw, 1965) found that the establishment of a new junior college resulted in a significant increase in the proportion of the population attending college. Medsker and Trent (1965A) found that communities with community colleges had the highest proportion of students going to college. More recently Knoell found that black youth attend community colleges in greater proportion than they attend other institutions of higher education.

There seems to be no question but that community colleges do increase college attendance patterns. More students will require upper-division education than would be true otherwise as a result of community college development.

Evidence has indicated previously that college attendance has been very much influenced by two factors—family or personal wealth and also academic ability as measured by previous

TABLE II

RATIO OF ONE STUDENT ENROLLED IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES TO TOTAL POPULATION IN STATES, 1967

| State | Fall 1967 Enrollment | Total Population (Estimated 1967) (1000's) | Ratio |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 17,540 | 3,540 | 1: 201.8 |
| Arkansas | 2,636 | 1,968 | 746.6 |
| Florida | 92,691 | 5,995 | 64.7 |
| Georgia | 15,610 | 4,509 | 288.9 |
| Kentucky | 9,923 | 3,189 | 321.4 |
| Louisiana | 6,617 | 3,662 | 553.4 |
| Maryland | 28,224 | 3,682 | 130.5 |
| Mississippi | 20,635 | 2,348 | 113.8 |
| North Carolina | 38,234 | 5,029 | 131.5 |
| Oklahoma | 8,302 | 2,495 | 300.5 |
| South Carolina | 14,846 | 2,599 | 175.1 |
| Tennessee | 6,226 | 3,892 | 625.1 |
| Texas | 87,595 | 10,869 | 124.1 |
| Virginia | 19,030 | 4,536 | 238.4 |
| West Virginia | 2,034 | 1,798 | 888.3 |
| United States | 1,810,964 | 197,863 | 109.3 |

Source: American Council on Education Fact Book
American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969 Directory

educational accomplishment and/or standardized tests. The community colleges have claimed to be democratizing agencies and to alleviate these discriminatory barriers. Unquestionably, financial inability affects 20 to 25 percent of the youth in their decisions to continue their formal education (Tillery, Donovan, and Sherman, 1969). Similarly Knoell found that one-half of urban students who did not plan to attend college cited financial problems as the reason (Knoell, 1969).

Recognizing that the fees charged to students may be only a minor part of the total costs when foregone income, transportation costs, and other necessary expenditures are considered, it still is valid to assume that fees may be critically influential in the final personal decision. The increase in the fee structure of the community colleges would seem to affect directly, then, the attendance patterns. During recent years there has been an increase in fees which is disturbing to many people. One state has seen student fees double in less than five years in the community colleges. *The commitment to democratize education cannot be adhered to if the amount of the fees charged to students continues to increase.*

In the area of providing for those with lower academic abilities there is evidence which indicates that students who would be inadmissible to other institutions are helped by the community colleges. Walker found that the average score of students transferring from a junior college to the university was a full quartile lower than those who moved from sophomore level to the junior level in the same institution. He also found that a sizeable group of students whose scores did not meet the universities' freshman admission requirements came into the university as juniors after completing the community college with an acceptable average. Many of those students went on to graduate with a baccalaureate degree, and we may hopefully assume became contributors to society at a more productive level. (Note the difference in estimated income between high school graduates and college graduates.)

Studies of student characteristics conducted by the Board of Regents in Florida has indicated that 7.3 percent of the freshmen enrolling in one of the community colleges were from families whose annual income was below $3,000. The comparable percentage for those freshmen in the adjacent university was 3.4 percent. Windham on the other hand estimated that 6 percent of Florida junior college enrollment comes from families with annual incomes below $3,000. He reports a similar percentage for the universities. His conclusion implies that for this lowest level of economic ability the community college serves no better than the university.

In spite of this evidence there seems to be little question but that the community colleges are helpful in *alleviating the barriers to education which are caused by economic ability and academic accomplishments.*

*Programs*

In almost any statement relating to community college planning, the purposes or functions are outlined as providing three major program areas as well as a number of educational services. These are usually listed as university parallel, occupational, and continuing education; the services usually include guidance and counseling, cultural improvement, and community services.

Some evidence regarding accomplishment relative to these programs and services is available. The admission requirements of baccalaureate degree-granting institutions are designed to prevent certain youth from attending those institutions. No one is so omniscient that he can feel certain such arbitrary decisions are entirely valid. The majority of students feel that their best abilities are outside traditional academic areas (Tillery, *et al.*, 1966). The open-door philosophy of the community college has provided a second chance to continue education for many youth while the range of ability of those who enter the community college as measured by standardized tests extends from the lowest percentile rank to the very highest. The mean appears to be at about the 60th percentile rank (*cf.* Florida Division of Community Junior Colleges). This mean is very nearly the same as the mean of the group who transfer from the junior colleges to the university as juniors, indicating that the range of academic abilities of the group completing the junior college is still similar to the entering freshman group.

Repeated studies have consistently indicated that approximately 30 percent of the entering freshmen in a community college proceed on to another institution to continue their work toward a baccalaureate degree (I.R.C., 1969). Walker's study indicates that about half of these complete their degree within another two-year period of time. This would mean that

15 to 20 percent of the entering freshmen in a community college do complete a baccalaureate program. The enrollment of freshmen entering the junior college in programs with other objectives is not in keeping with these statistics, however. Repeatedly colleges report that 65 to 90 percent of their students enroll in university parallel programs. Sophomore class enrollment is usually equal to 65 percent or less of entering freshmen. *There is no evidence that community colleges have been entirely successful in placing students in educational programs appropriate to their abilities and interests.*

Some institutions (*e.g.*, Miami-Dade Junior College, Gaston College, Northern Virginia Community College) have developed a variety of occupational programs which are attractive to a sizeable number of students. Other community colleges have few programs or courses which fall into these categories. The faculty attitude toward occupational programs is not always as sympathetic as one might wish.

Even Kurth and Mills' study does not indicate a universal acceptance by faculty for these program goals in a community college. As many as 13 percent of the faculty rejected terminal education as a function of the community college, and 47 percent specified their rejection of "adult vocational courses" as a community college function.

Perhaps the most important observation in relation to the vocational-technical programs is the continued apparent duplication and reported rivalry between community colleges and separately organized area vocational-technical schools. Some states have avoided these problems by assigning all post–high school vocational-technical education to the community colleges and have provided funds for operation of these programs in the community college budgets; other states have divided their limited resources between two types of postsecondary programs, one in the community college and another in the area schools. A third arrangement is found wherein all federal funds for vocational and technical education are allocated to area schools, leaving the community colleges to carry out either limited programs in occupational education or no programs in that area at all.

There are no satisfactory research studies available which evaluate the success of the occupational programs. The increasing number of students as well as the increasing percentage of students enrolled in such programs, however, may be considered as some indication of the increasing relevance these programs have for junior college students.

A number of studies have been completed which attempt to evaluate the quality of the university parallel programs of the community colleges. Knoell and Medsker's study is very likely as complete as any other one and may be considered a prototype study. Their major conclusions are:

1. Junior colleges increase educational opportunities for those who want baccalaureate degrees.

2. The general public has not as yet understood sufficiently well the value of the junior college alternative (to the four-year college or university).

3. There continues to be great need for coordinated planning between community colleges and universities.

4. Doors for transferring students need to be kept open without specific regard for the programs in which a student is enrolled.

5. All or most community college students could be successful in achieving their degree goals after transfer if they were more careful in their selection of colleges and major fields.

6. Major state universities which have strict admission requirements at the freshman level place many community college transfers in an unduly competitive position when they transfer at the junior level without proper counseling.

7. Diversity in higher education is an important consideration in planning a total program of higher education in a state. Junior college students should be made aware of the differences between institutions as an aid in selecting an appropriate upper-division institution.

8. Grades of C and below as earned in junior colleges are relatively meaningless indicators of success likelihood in baccalaureate institutions. A's and B's are more valid.

9. Junior colleges have not demonstrated that they are effective in educating students who have serious deficiencies prior to entering the junior college as far as continued work toward a baccalaureate degree is concerned.

10. There is so much overlap in the distribution of the academic aptitude of transfer students who complete their baccalaureate degree and those who drop out that test scores do not distinguish very efficiently between successes and failures. Junior college grades are more dependable predictors than test scores.

11. Transfers from junior colleges will overlap

considerably in academic ability with students who began work at the university; their mean score will be less than the nation's mean score.

12. During the first year after transfer, the grade-point average for the junior college student will most likely be half a grade point lower than his junior college grade-point average was.

13. Many junior college transfers have serious financial problems.

14. Counseling needs to be improved at all levels—elementary school, high school, junior college, and university.

15. There is serious lack of attention given to orientation of junior college transfers.

16. Two-year and four-year colleges need to work together on problems of articulation.

17. Attrition after transfer is higher than it should be.

18. Present articulation machinery is not adequate.

These conclusions are similarly supported by Walker, Hills, and other studies, and although they were written five years ago, it appears they are still valid conclusions.

It can be reported, on the other hand, that a great amount of work relating to articulation and transfer has been carried on in several states. Statewide agreements regarding general education requirements and transfer procedures have been developed and approved in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Virginia, Mississippi, and Texas. Many individual institutions have obtained solutions to their own problems by working directly with other institutions.

*Faculty*

There have developed very few university programs which are specifically designed for preparing faculty for community colleges. In 1947 Ordway Lead pointed out that comparatively lacking at the junior college level were positive measures for grappling with the special teaching problems of "this transitional two-year period." Koos even earlier than that called for special attention to the preservice preparation of junior college faculty.

More recently studies have indicated that many community college faculty came from other levels of education, from the military, and from business and industry, but that few were directly prepared for college teaching.

Kurth and Mills indicated that fewer faculty reported that they had received any special preparation in 1968 than had reported such course work in an earlier study of 1962. As pointed out above, the attitudes of faculty toward the role assigned to the community college is not always empathetic.

Within the past few years, federal funds have been made available for the preservice preparation and inservice improvement of community college faculty. Several universities have developed courses and programs under these grants. Such programs, however, do not begin to provide adequate numbers of persons to fill the vacancies created in the rapidly expanding community colleges in the region.

In some great measure the success of these colleges depends upon the quality of faculty. These must be persons who not only accept the role assigned to these institutions but also endorse it. Such attitudes and understandings are seldom attained in the usual master's degree and doctoral programs which have been typically research oriented. *One might well conclude that there is little success to be pointed out at the present time in reference to faculty preservice preparation.*

*Counseling*

Counseling has been repeatedly described as a major function of the community college. If students are to be helped in making intelligent and thoughtful as well as knowledgeable choices, there must be counselors available to help. Yet Raines found only two states, Florida and California, where there were anywhere near adequate counseling services provided. At least one state in this region has refused to provide financial support in community college budgets for the position of counselor.

The need for counseling is best illustrated by a study which reported that 80 percent of entering freshmen indicated that they planned to complete a four-year degree. Actually 22 percent did transfer to an upper division institution after graduation from the community college and 9 percent transferred prior to graduation. Apparently 50 percent of the entering freshmen made a considerable change in their educational plans after they began their work. Another study has indicated that 85 percent of students who withdrew from a community college did not discuss their plans to drop out with anyone at the college.

*It seems unlikely based on evidence from these studies that anyone could assume that the*

*guidance and counseling programs which are currently in operation in community colleges could be considered adequate for the community college students.*

**Results Affecting All of Higher Education**

If the community college is related to a total program of higher education in a state, the role and scope of each type of institution as well as that of each institution must be identified. The assignment of certain responsibilities to each college will contribute to a total master plan which would provide for the needs of all persons in the state. The more traditional limitations which have been placed upon the areas which are considered to be part of higher education are no longer acceptable. Higher education in the 1970's must encompass all education which is made available to those who have completed high school or who have passed the normal age for attending high school. There must be a specific provision for each person.

Some states have been able to develop this total program of post–high school education with interrelated assignments of role and scope to the various institutions; others have not. Some states have developed well-articulated plans for institutional growth and development; others have not. In those states, however, where an overall plan has been developed and implemented, the local pressures to convert a respected community college into a four-year institution have been successfully resisted. There will undoubtedly always be pressures to convert junior colleges because many people do not completely understand the role and function of the community college; these pressures will, however, interfere with the sound development of a total program of higher education.

*Conversion*

In this region of the nation thus far, six states have permitted one or more junior colleges under public control to become four-year degree-granting institutions. In one of these states there were serious attempts made to continue the occupational programs which were characteristic of the institution's former status as a junior college; in the others there has apparently been no attempt to continue these programs, and they were phased out as rapidly as possible or were extended into four-year degree programs. In several instances, there were no occupational programs in any case.

TABLE III

STATES REPORTING A STATEWIDE PLAN FOR COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES, 1969

| State | A Plan | Percentage of Total Population Included in Plan | Percent of Plan Implemented, 1969 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | No | — | — |
| Arkansas | Yes | 80 | 25 |
| Florida | Yes | 99 | 96 |
| Georgia | Yes | 90 | 90 |
| Kentucky | No | — | — |
| Louisiana | No | — | — |
| Maryland | Yes | 100 | 90 |
| Mississippi | No | — | — |
| North Carolina | Yes | 100 | 50 |
| Oklahoma | Yes | 90 | 60 |
| South Carolina | No | — | — |
| Tennessee | No | — | — |
| Texas | Yes | 90 | — |
| Virginia | Yes | 100 | 50 |
| West Virginia | No | — | — |

Source: Adapted from L. H. Arney. *State Pattern of Financial Support for Community Colleges.*

In all of these states there is apparently a continued need for the programs and services of a community college, and new institutions to accommodate these needs have in several instances been established or have been requested to replace the converted institution. In other words, the changed function of an institution left an educational gap in those communities. One may observe, however, that in those states where strong, dynamic, and comprehensive community college programs have developed, there has also been a firm policy which prevented any change of institutional function in this respect. In other words, the necessity for a firm policy which considers the total post–high school needs of a state and assigns specific roles and functions to institutions is most essential, and since a community college has a special role, it should be maintained.

Other questions remain unanswered for the present. Examples of questions which should be answered are:

1. If a university gives less attention to freshman and sophomore students, will its graduate program be improved?

2. Are those universities which screen their freshman enrollment most carefully achieving a higher retention rate than those which screen less carefully?

3. What effect upon program development, especially as such development relates to more rapid completion of the usual college course work, does the limitation of admission to only high-ability students have?

4. What is the relative success of the upper-division university?

5. Do states which provide community college opportunities have a higher ratio of junior-level students (when compared to total population) than those which have few if any community colleges?

To answer these and related questions, research studies need to be developed. The Altman Study on upper-division institutions is one of the few which thus far has attempted to answer these questions.

### Results Affecting Society in General

Impact studies have not been generally developed as of the present date. There is little concrete evidence which indicates the actual effect a community college may have upon its environs. Many claims are made which stress the cultural, the economic, or the social values of an institution upon the community in which it is located. Mostly, such claims are unproved.

Earlier in this report evidence was cited which demonstrated the fact that the community colleges provided opportunity for students who did not previously consider continued education within the realm of possibility. This evidence would support the contention that while the effect is not universal, there is a sizeable increase in participation in education when a community college is established.

The increase in cultural activities within a community has been documented in a number of instances. The increase in economic status of individuals has been documented by Kastner and by others. There has not, however, been a complete analysis carried out anywhere.

Some questions which need answers are:

1. What are valid measurable outcomes which may be used to evaluate the effectiveness of an institution?

2. Is there any discernible relationship between the inputs such as level of financial support, quality of faculty, institutional integrity and outputs such as success of graduates, socio-economic improvement in the community, or cultural improvements in the community?

3. How can decisions regarding allocation of limited resources be made within a program-planning budgeting system?

### Summary

As one examines the growth and development of the community colleges in the Southeast, he is impressed by several facts:

1. There has been tremendous growth in community colleges within the past 20 years; most of it has occurred during the past 10 years. There is evidence to support the position that these institutions do increase educational opportunity beyond the high school.

2. There is a great deal of difference from state to state in the development of community colleges both in relationship to total population (from 1 in 65 persons to 1 in 888 persons) and in relationship to the total enrollment in higher education (from 1.5 percent to 44.1 percent).

3. There is very little information relative to the impact of the community colleges in the states of the region. While agencies in several states have collected information regarding some areas of impact, the general level of information is inadequate and insufficiently accurate.

4. Some commonly accepted definitions for

use in collecting data would enable the researcher to develop defensible analytic information; these are currently not available.

5. There is apparently a very unequal opportunity for education in the states of the region. The net effect of this fact has not been adequately assessed.

6. There are few university programs designed to prepare faculty for teaching in the community colleges. Most faculty programs for teaching are at other levels of education.

7. Community colleges can unquestionably report that they provide opportunity to students who otherwise might not have it. These are students who have financial problems (except those in the lowest economic brackets); those who have academic problems; those whose interests and abilities require a program which is oriented toward areas of study not usually found in most institutions.

8. There is no clear evidence to indicate how well the community colleges are succeeding in helping people select appropriate education.

9. Role and scope planning for higher education should include community colleges as a part of a total plan. This specifically means that changes in institutional role will affect the entire state plan, not just a single institution. Community colleges cannot be considered as potential four-year institutions.

10. Planning for articulation between institutions is too important to be left to chance. Specific programs and agreements must be developed. Constant attention is required for successful articulation.

11. The concept of accountability is not uniformly and universally accepted among community colleges in the region.

### Selected Bibliography


Altman, Robert A. *The Upper Division College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

Arney, Lawrence H. *State Patterns of Financial Support for Community Colleges*. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1970.

Bashaw, W. L. "The Effect of the Community Junior Colleges on the Local Population Who Seek Higher Education." *Journal of Educational Research*. 58 (7) (March, 1965), 327-329.

Collins, Charles C. *Junior College Student Personnel Programs: What They Are and What They Should Be*. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Davis, Billy H. *The Significance for Selected Florida Community Junior Colleges of the College Experience of Students Who Have Withdrawn*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1970.

Eells, Walter Crosby and Martorana, S. V. "Do Junior Colleges Become Four-Year Colleges?" *Higher Education*. XIII (6) (February, 1957), 110-115.

Eurich, Alvin C., ed. *Campus 1980*. New York: Delacorte Press, 1968.

Florida Community Junior College Interinstitutional Research Council. *Where Are They Now?* A follow-up study of first-time-in-college freshmen in Florida's community junior colleges in Fall, 1966. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, 1969.

Florida Division of Community Junior Colleges. *Five Years of Progress*. Tallahassee: State Department of Education, 1963.

Kastner, Harold H. *Economic Implications of Community Junior College Education*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1962.

Knoell, D. M. *People Who Need College: A Report on Students We Have Yet To Serve*. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970.

Knoell, Dorothy M. and Medsker, L. L. *From Junior to Senior College: A National Study of the Transfer Student*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1965.

Kurth, Edwin L. and Mills, Eric R. *Analysis of Degree of Faculty Satisfactions in Florida Community Junior Colleges*. Project No. 8-D-047, United States Office of Education, 1968.

Medsker, L. L. and Trent, J. W. *The Influence of Different Types of Public Higher Institutions on College Attendance from Varying Socioeconomic and Ability Levels*. (USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 438). Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1965A.

Schultz, Raymond E. and Stickler, W. Hugh. "Vertical Extension of Academic Programs in Institutions of Higher Education." *The Educational Record*. 46 (3) (Summer, 1965), 231-241.

Tillery, D., Donovan, D., and Sherman, B. *SCOPE Grade Eleven Profile—1968 Questionnaires Selected Items*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1969.

Walker, John E. *Academic Performance of Native and Transfer Students in the Upper Division of the University of Florida 1966-68*. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education (Office of Academic Affairs), University of Florida, 1969.

Windham, Douglas M. *State Financed Higher Education and the Distribution of Income in Florida*. Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1969.

# A Governor Comments

*Arch A. Moore, Jr., Governor of West Virginia*

FROM the outset, I would like to commend Dr. Wattenbarger for his comprehensive and incisive study on this phase of higher education. It is my understanding, Dr. Wattenbarger, that you will be visiting in West Virginia in the not too distant future. We look forward to that visit and to sharing with you then some of the problems and progress that we are confronting in our efforts to improve higher education.

It may come as somewhat of a surprise to many of you, but West Virginia has more institutions of higher learning per capita than any other state in the union. We are quite proud of this fact, as we are proud of the academic achievements of all the colleges and universities in our state.

As with all those throughout the country who are concerned with higher education, we in West Virginia are being challenged to keep our curriculum relevant to the changing conditions of our society.

In view of Dr. Wattenbarger's remarks, I believe I should comment briefly upon the changes that have occurred within the past year and a half in West Virginia's higher education system. Last year, legislation was passed to consolidate the functions and operation of higher education under one governing body—a Board of Regents in charge of two universities and nine state-supported colleges. This was an important step for us in West Virginia, as it now permits us to reexamine curriculum, institutional functions, and emphasis in a more cohesive manner. It also has meant the beginning of moves to eliminate duplication, both in terms of human and financial effort. It signals the initial step to make higher education in our state more relevant to the needs of the students, and subsequently, to the public that supports it.

We in West Virginia, like our sister states, are mindful of the need to keep the educational dialogue on a constant, open wavelength with the student body. In line with this, I was extremely privileged to appoint to the Board of Regents a student representative, whose responsibility is to see that the concerns of the respective student councils and college and university groups are given a fair and impartial hearing at all board meetings.

Within the short period of time that the Board of Regents has been operational, it has begun the task of modernizing higher education. The board has demonstrated quite admirably, I am proud to say, its willingness and determination to meet the challenge in an exceptionally high level of objectivity. We are most fortunate in this respect and also in having the capable leadership of Dr. Prince Woodard as chancellor.

The board is presently engaged in a study to determine the need for two-year community colleges in West Virginia. Recommendations for needed modifications of the present higher education system will be based on this study.

I should like at this time to note a few points which indicate the higher education trends in West Virginia. We find that the factors which have operated to increase the number of people who continue their formal education past high school have operated in West Virginia. Of the 1968-1969 graduates of the state's high schools, 45 percent enrolled in some kind of post–high school program. When we break down that percentage total, we find that 33.15 percent enrolled in four-year colleges; 2.75 percent enrolled in two-year higher education institutions; and 9.07 percent enrolled in other post–high school education programs.

The West Virginia Department of Education's continuing education study has shown that the percentages of high school graduates who continue in formal education vary from a high of about 60 percent to a low of about 20 percent. The study also shows quite clearly that the counties most easily accessible to colleges have the highest percentages.

West Virginia's higher education system is basically comprised of universities, state colleges, and branches, rather than community colleges. The present system places a college or a branch within 35 miles of 90 percent of the population.

Most of our four-year colleges also offer two-year programs, thus making higher education opportunities open to most of our high school graduates. Although this is the way our higher education system operates now, this does not mean that it will not become engaged

in the development of community and two-year colleges.

Many of our young people are not interested in pursuing four-year academic education. Indeed, we also realize that emphasis on a four-year degree may have been overdone. Because there is a high demand for technical and trade skills which do not require four years of college and because many of our young people are not interested in or suited for academic pursuits, we realize that we must fill the void that exists between high school and the four-year college. Medicine, dentistry, engineering, and business are fields that can be served through two-year community college programs.

Even though a state community college program does not exist in our higher education system, we are attempting to meet the manpower shortage and ease the burden of heavy enrollments in our colleges and universities through reexamination of our vocational school curriculum. We have found much duplication of curriculum, as I am sure many of you have. More disconcerting has been the tendency to offer courses that are no longer of any real value in relation to sorely needed trade skills in air conditioning, auto repairs, electronics, refrigeration, machine shop, plumbing, and mechanical and technical work.

In short, we are now deeply involved in changing the direction that our vocational education program has been taking for more than three decades. Where before, each county would build a new educational facility next to existent ones and would seek to have a vocational educational facility next to a high school plant, we are now moving into the regional concept of vocational education. By pooling financial resources and by providing a broader curriculum that is pertinent to the manpower needs of our state, we plan to make better use of the tax dollar and at the same time provide and offer the technical opportunities to match the labor market demands. Underlying this move is the long-range effort to bring some order out of the chaotic and fragmented approach to vocational training. In this effort, our decisions must be made as West Virginians, not as residents of a city or county.

This departure from the past by no means is the complete way to encourage our youth to improve and better their opportunities beyond their high school education. No one particular aspect of education contains the total solution. But we believe the regional vocational training concept to be a step in the right direction.

# Trends, Problems, and Opportunities

*LeRoy A. Cornelsen, Special Assistant, Bureau of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, U. S. Office of Education*

WHEN asked to critique Dr. James L. Wattenbarger's paper, I agreed to do so before having read it. After receiving a copy and reviewing its contents, I cannot objectively critique its premises because I agree with most of the positions taken by Dr. Wattenbarger. Occasional controversy, divergent opinions, and forthright debate would, I suppose, create interest at this point. Being unable to take issue with Dr. Wattenbarger's assessment of the community college, I would like to highlight several points that are especially significant about the community college movement.

My thoughts on this subject result from experiences in the administration of vocational, technical, and adult education at the local, state and national levels and from my work in industry. My comments are intended to reflect my personal observation of trends, problems, and opportunities.

Although Dr. Wattenbarger isolated the main factors causing the enormous growth of postsecondary education, one cannot isolate all factors affecting this growth. I believe this tremendous growth has come largely because of the technological developments in our economy which require the application of sophisticated technological practice for effective participation. Societies reflect in large measure the degree of application of technology. This applied technology affects every facet of our lives and bears a direct relationship to the accelerating rate of change in several common activities.

This dimension of change in Western civilization is, in general, not a change of degree but a change of kind. The applications of science and technology to the agricultural, industrial, and commercial institutions of our society have been so great as to create a revolution in the social, economic, and educational operations of the country.

The rapid growth of postsecondary institutions in the last decade is a response to fill a need created by this massive change. People, in general, have begun to recognize the direct relationship between educational achievements and employment success. Effective individual participation demands an increasing breadth of preparation. Our costly government programs of welfare, retraining, and income support attest to the fact that without appropriate job preparation one is destined to become a bystander while the economy and society move on with even more rapid change.

The community college, as a concept for delivering educational opportunities to an intended target population, possesses unique capabilities for filling this postsecondary educational need by providing a wide variety of educational services to communities. This institution's success, I feel, will be largely dependent upon the ability of its administrators to emphasize its unique characteristics, among which are:

1. *It provides an "adult" oriented educational environment.* As opposed to the atmosphere of most high schools, the environment must be conducive to adults whether they be entering freshman, those who return for formal instruction after dropping out of high school, or the employed adult who seeks to improve his career potential.

2. *It is geographically accessible to enrollees via popular local transportation.* The community college should be located within commuting distance of the large majority of community residents.

3. *The tuition and fees should be nominal or free and admission should be open to all.*

4. *The institution should maintain effective relationships with community businesses and industries.*

These main characteristics are important for a community college to fulfill its basic purposes. Four purposes of equal value are:

1. To develop human resources needed in the local and regional labor market.

2. To provide the first two years of a baccalaureate program.

3. To provide occupational preparation at the preemployment and technical level.

4. To provide advance career preparation for employed adults.

There are some troublesome problems which may impede the progress of the community college movement. The first is the

failure of the community college administrator to capitalize on the role of the comprehensive two-year postsecondary institution. By comprehensive, I mean the attainment of at least the four stated purposes just mentioned. Included in this problem is the necessity of maintaining a balanced program. Each purpose must be served or the community college reverts to either a "senior" high school, "vocational" school, or a "junior" college depending, of course, upon the purpose overemphasized.

Also related to this problem of scope and role is the rare articulation of community college programs with those at nearby high schools and four-year institutions. Lack of articulation is bad enough, but duplication of programs already being successfully operated by nearby institutions is extremely wasteful of limited educational resources and almost always results in lower quality programs. This duplication, which often results in competition for the same student, can be avoided as Dr. Wattenbarger has suggested by developing a firm statewide policy which identifies the role and scope of the community college and prevents its change and function.

How well the community college is fulfilling its major purposes is not easily assessed. The dearth of evaluative data is so acute that at best one can look only with some understanding at the input side. Outcomes, program impact, and graduate success are, in general, poorly reported. This lack of data can be clarified by the fact that we know in fiscal year 1969 there were 1,316 postsecondary institutions with vocational or technical programs, of which 504 were community colleges. In addition, we know that a total of $51.2 million was spent in operating vocational and technical programs at the postsecondary level, and that 14.7 percent of all vocational funds went to community colleges and 18.1 percent to technical/vocational area schools as contrasted with 3.2 percent to four-year colleges and universities.

What does this mean in terms of results and impact? No one really knows. This problem is being addressed, although modestly, by a study being sponsored by the Office of Education this fiscal year to:

1. Define the role of community colleges.
2. Identify unique relationships of the community college to higher education and vocational-technical education.
3. Identify the administrative and management problems of community colleges—and their possible solutions.
4. And—most importantly—determine what is their impact on aiding high school graduates in maximizing potential educational attainment.

This lack of outcome data is most serious. The need for evaluation of program effectiveness in community colleges (although not unique among two-year postsecondary institutions) must be given immediate attention. Stressing accountability for results instead of counting enrollments and dollars spent should, I believe, allow comprehensive community colleges to gain full recognition for the educational value derived from investment in this special purpose institution.

The community college has great potential for helping implement the five goals of the Southern Regional Education Board that Dr. Wattenbarger quoted in his paper. In identifying these goals, applicable even at the community college level, the Board has performed a valuable service to its member states and to the nation.

We must remember, however, that as community colleges are unique among educational institutions, so, too, each state in the Southern region has a unique history of educational development that makes the application of a "model" community college system difficult, if not impossible. Adaptation of effective practices and program features is a laudable practice, but each state must assess its present institutional resources to provide comprehensive two-year postsecondary education. In some states an expanded mission for existing community colleges will satisfy the need; in others, technical institutions and postsecondary vocational schools can be broadened in scope so as also to provide for prebaccalaureate education. While there is really nothing magic about the term *community college*, the special functions it performs offer opportunities for community service, relatively inexpensive career preparation, and high quality higher education within commuting distance of a student's residence.

# III. Maximizing Opportunity for Black Students

## State Planning for Expanded Opportunity

*D. Robert Graham, State Representative, Florida*

THERE are three "givens" which face a state planning to expand higher educational opportunities for its black youth. First, the dual system of higher education, through which black educational opportunities have traditionally been afforded, will not be a permanent institution. Although there is considerable controversy as to the date and method by which the dual system will be dismantled, few would contend that with the integration of elementary and secondary education a segregated pattern of higher education will inevitably prevail. There is equal recognition that for the immediate future the predominantly black institutions provide a necessary and vital resource. Finally, a realistic assessment of the dimension of the problem leads to the conclusion that meaningful expansion of opportunities will require a careful orchestration of all its higher education institutions.

Because of these truths, the state role is critical. It is only the state which can marshal the resources and leadership which will be required to attain this goal.

To date, the experience of Florida, and I gather of most other states, has been one of ad hoc action. Individual and institutional examples of leadership and aggressive desire can be pointed out, but there has been little evidence of a comprehensive pattern.

In response to this and other post–high school issues which called for a concerted state response, the Florida legislature established the Select Council on Post–High School Education (SCOPE) in 1967. This council was composed of representatives of the various groups within Florida higher education that would share the responsibility for implementing whatever recommendations were eventually made: the legislature, the commissioner of education, the governor, the board of regents, the junior college board, the vocational-technical board, and independent higher education. After two and one-half years' study and an interim report to the 1969 legislature, the council submitted its final report in March of this year.

A major section of the report was devoted to expanding opportunities in higher education for blacks. This attention to the peculiar needs of black students in Florida was stimulated by a study commissioned by the council to the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) entitled "Postsecondary Educational Opportunities for the Negro Student in Florida" and published in June of 1969 by the Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity. The SREB report indicated that, although black college-age youth represent 17.8 percent of the state's college-age population, blacks represent only 7.4 percent of the enrollment in the public and private colleges and universities of Florida. The report strongly emphasized the necessity for a broadly based state effort to provide meaningful educational opportunities for Florida's black youth.

The principal recommendation of the Select Council's report was that the community junior colleges and area vocational centers should be the primary institutions for affording this opportunity. The junior colleges and area vocational centers are uniquely equipped to assume this responsibility through their open-door admission policy, the fact that this open door is meaningful through low cost and high accessibility, and the existence of a receptive social and academic environment. The environmental dimension of the junior college and the area vocational-technical center illustrates the advantage which these relatively new institutions—which were established without a tradition of either black or white—have as the institution of opportunity.

Based in part on the preliminary recommendations made by the council to the 1969 legislature, special compensatory education units were added to the junior college funding formula. These units increase by 50 percent the amount of state funds available for remedial and compensatory programs. Unfortunately, the 1970 gubernatorial budget did not recommend funds for this program. Although the House of Representatives voted to restore the one and one-half million dollars, the final conference committee eliminated all appropriations for junior college compensatory units. The failure to demonstrate the relationship between additional funds for compensatory programs and improved performance was the stated reason for this action. This skepticism is illustrative of an increasing attitude among the public and the politicians. The lesson should be clear to educators that intuitive assumptions of relationship between expenditure and performance must be reinforced by demonstrable evidence.

The predominantly white institutions in the state university system were assigned the responsibility of providing the last two years of undergraduate instruction for the junior college transfers. It is apparent that the effects of cultural, economic, and educational deprivation cannot be totally overcome during the first two years of an undergraduate program. Therefore, the specialized undergraduate and graduate-professional programs must assume their portion of the responsibility by providing appropriate programs to meet the needs of black students.

The independent institutions have a unique role in the total state effort to meet the needs of black students. In Florida, the major independent institutions are located in or near urban areas where the great concentration of black students reside. The independent institutions, in many instances, have demonstrated a greater openness and a greater willingness to innovate in curriculum and in meeting the personal and financial aid needs of black students. The SCOPE report recommended that the state give further encouragement to independent institutions, through the provision of additional scholarship funds and institutional grants to independent institutions which have, or agree to develop, compensatory education programs for disadvantaged students.

The traditionally black institutions, both private and public, will, for the foreseeable future, be a major factor in providing educational opportunities for black students. There has been great interest in Florida, and in most Southern states, in redefining the role and scope of the predominantly black institutions. Unfortunately, much of this redefinition has been essentially an articulation of the status quo. The council focused on what it thought to be the unique features of the black institutions as they fit into a comprehensive state plan. A principal feature is the residential character of the typical black institution. This quality complements the primary responsibility of the community-based junior college, as it affords an opportunity for a rational admissions policy, with the residential institution enrolling those students whose home environment is such that, when combined with their inadequate background, success in higher education is extremely unlikely.

As mentioned in the introductory statement, one of the factors which is currently affecting state planning for expanded higher education opportunities for blacks is the receding role of the federal government. This factor imposes a new challenge to state leadership: can and will the states respond in this significant and highly sensitive area from a realization of educational and social justice and an appraisal of the long-term interests of the state, but without the prod of a federal mandate? This may well be one of the issues on which the long-term viability of state government as an independent policy-making force in the American federal system will be determined.

# New Roles for Black Colleges

*Herman B. Smith, Jr., Director, Office for the Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges*

THE objective of maximizing opportunity for black students can be furthered by identifying, studying, establishing, and facilitating new roles for the traditionally Negro colleges.

The enumeration and presentation of new roles for these important institutions should be based on an articulate point of view which helps to make clear the context in which new roles are presented. My fundamental orientation regarding predominantly Negro colleges includes six generalizations.

1. *The traditionally or predominantly Negro colleges and universities are not new, untried and untested institutions.* Most of them were founded in the decades following the Civil War, between 1867 and 1900, although initially many did not grant degrees. Nevertheless, only three of the black colleges are less than 50 years old. So, in this group, there is a long history of these institutions serving the black population.

2. *These institutions have served the nation, their respective states, and local communities productively and consistently under less than favorable conditions as responsible institutional centers of goodwill, community leadership, and economic opportunity.*

During the periods when few other community agencies exhibited much interest, the black schools stood as concentrations of educated leadership committed to the task of serving as vehicles and channels for needed communication among diverse groups of people of goodwill. Historically, they have provided a sense of direction and stability to people, both black and white, during times of distress and grave oppression and amid feelings of despair and hopelessness. Unquestionably, this service has been vital in the past and the need for more of the same today is hardly less vital.

3. *Most of these schools are located strategically and are serving a preponderance of Negroes in a unique way.* Most of the public Negro colleges, for example, are located in large black population centers. Mississippi Valley State College, located in the Delta area of that state, is surrounded by approximately 375,000 black people, most of whom are poor and otherwise culturally disadvantaged. Morgan State College is located in Maryland's largest metropolitan area which is about 40 percent black in population and which until relatively recently did not include another major multipurpose public institution of higher education.

It is yet true, based on past practices and recently reported trends, that the black people would be largely unserved were it not for the predominantly Negro colleges. Seventy-eight percent of last year's black college graduates earned their degrees at predominantly black institutions.

These institutions have a history of not denying admission to prospective enrollees because they are poor, have made low scores on certain standardized tests, or because they are victims of other types of cultural disadvantage. Rather, these colleges have accepted consistently a very heterogeneous student population, including the severely disadvantaged. They have stimulated and facilitated broad individual development to the extent that their graduates have been prepared to assume useful, responsible roles throughout the world.

4. *The black colleges and universities have shown, by and large, the disposition and the ability to grow and change with the times.* Recognizing that change does not occur merely because of a perception of the need for change but is determined, also, by the desire and the ability to change as well as by having the necessary resources for change, the record of these institutions compares favorably with that of American higher education in general.

Administrative and organizational changes, changes in curriculum offerings and curricular choices of students, and changes in composition of the student body are all evident at the black colleges. The direction of the trend is clear. In the public Negro colleges taken as a group, for example, about 3 percent of the undergraduate students are non-Negro. About 13 percent of the graduate students are so characterized. This particular change compares favorably with statistics reported for the whole of American higher education.

5. *From their inception, black institutions have been what their own governing boards have*

*expected, required, and permitted them to be.* Founded during adverse periods in our nation's history, with meager financial resources and little professional guidance or support, these schools were assigned narrow, constricted objectives. Fayetteville State University, for example, came into existence 93 years ago as the "state colored normal school" with an original state appropriation of $2,000. It is reported that ensuing appropriations for this institution remained at approximately this same level for the next 30 years.

The growth, development, and emergence of Fayetteville State University and other such schools as multipurpose institutions of collegiate standing is testimony to the ambitions, perceptions, perseverance, and stamina of black people in their quest for expanded educational opportunities. An unrelenting negation of the constricted original objectives has enabled these institutions, with approval of their respective governing boards, increasingly to serve more fully the needs and desires of their constituents.

Despite past handicaps and unhappy experiences, the predominantly black institutions have utilized available resources in ways perceived by them to be the most effective for carrying out assigned educational tasks. They have remained positive, wholesome, and committed fully to the tenets of our American society. It is difficult to envision how any black institution or any other educational institution, for that matter, can become any more than its governing board expects, requires, and permits it to be.

6. *During the contemporary period with increased concern for* (*a*) *expanding educational opportunities for black people;* (*b*) *improving the quality of life for all in America; and* (*c*) *identifying and channeling needed human and financial resources to accomplish the two preceding goals, it is not unreasonable to conclude that the traditionally Negro colleges are well suited to assume new roles commensurate with developing thrusts in the nation.*

It must be stated here as a caveat that there is no feeling that the black colleges have exhausted their traditional roles in the higher education and social scheme. Indeed the available facts would suggest the need for an intensified continuation of their historic objectives in response to America's continued manpower needs. For example, it is reported by a task force representing two national medical associations, the American Hospital Association and the Association of American Medical Colleges, that black students today comprise a mere 2.8 percent of the total student population in American medical schools. Another report calls attention to the fact that there are only 3,000 black lawyers in the country, less than 1 percent of the total and most of whom are concentrated outside the Southern region. Such specialized fields as engineering, architecture, urban planning, and others are similarly lacking in representation of black practitioners. Clearly, then, black schools must continue to increase their effort in producing professionals and motivated candidates who can gain admission and complete required programs in order to improve this unsatisfactory picture.

The choices made by black colleges and universities and their students, however, should not be governed in the future by their perception of constricted opportunities for acquired skills and competencies but by conscious decisions made after an investigation of numerous and varying options. The latter can be accomplished if new roles for the black schools are made available.

In the context of a discussion of new roles for the traditionally Negro colleges, I am convinced fully of the importance of partnerships, linkages, and genuine and full cooperation in the development and execution of educational plans for the future. I can see no positive future ultimately for the total population if our past dualistic approach to educational planning is maintained.

Faculty programming which merely duplicates existing educational facilities and services, failure to involve meaningfully all segments of the total educational communities in further planning, and failure to recognize and utilize the varied institutional potential which exists within a given educational community are not only contrary to past recommendations of components of the Southern Regional Education Board, but more importantly these procedures are certain to increase existing polarization in our region and nation.

What new roles, then, might the traditionally Negro colleges assume in higher education and in service to people? Five possibilities are suggested. Indications of possible new roles become evident as one surveys the emerging or projected programs on college campuses across the region as well as governmental priorities in improving the quality of life in America.

1. *The Negro college could participate meaningfully and substantially in the whole effort by*

*the several states and the federal government to alleviate and solve urban problems.* Urban education, urban housing, and urban transportation are three distinct areas of concern today at both state and federal levels of government. Increasing amounts of money are being allocated for the study of specific problems and approaches to solution of the problems, including the increased production of graduates who have needed skills for implementation of programs finally adopted by the respective governments. It is only logical to expect that more black people would be involved in such programs, for they comprise in substantial proportions the population of the urban areas. Correspondingly the locations of a large number of the black institutions place them in close proximity to the problem areas under consideration. Tennessee State University, for example, is located in the midst of the Nashville Model Cities neighborhood which has an 81 percent black population.

Availability of qualified personnel should not be a hindering factor, for unquestionably the bulk of personnel of the black institutions with advanced professional training have studied at leading and respected universities of the nation. Any present problem of insufficient numbers of staff members needed to perform assigned educational tasks could be met as the perception develops that expanded opportunities do, in fact, exist for greater, more meaningful participation in the study of the alleviation of major statewide and national problems.

Recent action of the United States Department of Transportation provides a specific example of this particular new role. The secretary of the department has announced three grants totaling almost a half million dollars to Atlanta University, North Carolina A & T State University, and Southern University in Baton Rouge for research and training purposes, thus enabling these three institutions to begin participation in the department's Urban Mass Transportation Program.

Southern University's grant will enable it to continue and strengthen its program of summer internships for students in the Department of Transportation in Washington. The grant will also make possible an internship experience in Washington for a Southern University professor of engineering in order that he can develop a better grasp of manpower needs and developmental challenges in mass urban transportation. Further, the grant will assist the university in developing and inaugurating a new course in highway building in its College of Engineering this fall.

North Carolina A & T State University, one of only three fully accredited schools of engineering in North Carolina, can now proceed similarly with assured financial support.

In making the announcement, the secretary stated that although these grants were firsts, they were just a start in the venture of developing greater involvement and utilization of the potential of the black colleges in the important work of the U. S. Department of Transportation. Not only is the financial outlay involved here important to the programs and development of the three universities in question, but the expression of confidence and professional support by this department of the federal government also is tremendously important to the continuing work and service of these institutions.

In this context, the several states, aside from their financial capabilities, can be valuable in helping to interpret and promote the potential of these important black colleges to various sources of financial and professional support within the state and at the level of the federal government. A strong partnership of the local black institution, the state political and professional structure, and the federal government can result in an importantly expanded production of well-prepared personnel who are available and qualified to help attack contemporary problems of society.

The foregoing point of view is no less valid when focused on the matters of urban housing and urban education. In fact, many of the concerns related to urban education derive from the rapid buildup of concentrations of black people in urban population centers. In view of the historic contributions of black institutions in the area of education, it would be sadly ironic if these same institutions today did not assume, with ample professional and financial support, a greater, more important role in addressing their concern to current problems and possibilities of urban education.

2. *The Negro college could be a full-fledged partner in the current thrust to probe and develop the potential for improving the quality of life in urban America.*

The junior senator from my state of Georgia has spoken repeatedly about the urgency of directing increased attention to the conditions, needs, and potentials of life today in our rural

areas. In this view I agree with him fully. Continued mass migration to urban locations because of impoverished opportunities for a good life in rural America increases the chances that the full realization of everyone's needs and desires will be impeded or thwarted.

Housing patterns and needs of rural people, health conditions and needs, educational practices and problems, social conditions of rural America, especially the rural South—all are, to a large extent, yet inadequately charted areas which remain as challenges to be met by our positive commitments to people and our advanced technology. This is particularly true of the black population. Yet these individuals deserve the fullest enjoyment of the fruits of life in America.

Adequate, effective communication is one important need here, especially communication with the rural residents. Black institutions, particularly those with land-grant status and agricultural programs, are uniquely equipped and qualified by historic commitments, by prepared, sensitive personnel, and by actual physical location to serve this need.

3. *The Negro college could be an important source for increased production of well-prepared personnel for service in the respective branches of state government.*

Recognized or unrecognized, accepted or unaccepted, one of the real problems existing in our respective states today is the almost total absence of Negro professional employees in the various branches of state government. This is a very striking phenomenon in 1970 when one contemplates the fact that a substantial segment of the respective states' population is black, that many of the black institutions of higher education are located a short distance from the capitols, and that, in many cases, the capitol grounds are almost ringed by black residents.

It would appear that a well-conceived partnership of state government and black colleges could result in the production of a dramatically increased pool of enthusiastic, wholesomely motivated, qualified black manpower for utilization by the states in the continued and improved functioning of the several areas of state government.

A program now in its second year at Kentucky State College, which incidentally now is approximately 40 percent white in student population, offers one clear example of how this potential role for Negro colleges could be expanded. Called the Frankfort Semester and established originally after close coordination with and support from the elected state officials of Kentucky, the seven-month program is designed "to provide orientation and specialized training, including that of research and individual performance and responsibility, for selected undergraduate students in the problems and administration of state government." A further goal of the program is "to inspire intelligent and eager young men and women to seek challenging careers of public service at the state government level." Basically, the Frankfort Semester is an internship program which is funded by the Kentucky General Assembly and is administered by Kentucky State College with full cooperation of four other state schools which are predominantly white. In fact, the Governor of Kentucky serves as honorary chairman of the Frankfort Semester Committee charged with planning all details.

During an assigned semester, selected students leave their parent campus and take up residence at Kentucky State College which is located at Frankfort, site of the state capitol. Their work for this special period consists of formal study in specialized advanced seminars, a series of lectures by officials of state government, and an internship period in some office of state government which runs concurrently with the seminars. Each intern is paid a monthly stipend. Regular faculty members from each of the participating institutions take part in the seminars.

Outcomes of the Frankfort Semester Program include (1) a promising program of valid specialized training in state government operations for interested students; (2) a sustained relationship of college students and state government officials in a supervised training situation; (3) a developing resource pool of appropriately educated personnel for recruitment to vacancies in state government; and (4) a significant opportunity for Kentucky State College to function in an important new leadership role.

Since a total of seven of the public predominantly Negro institutions, plus several of the private Negro colleges and universities, are located in state capitols, it would appear that this new role could be explored with a minimum of difficulties.

4. *The Negro college could be a more active participant in supported research and services in the area of environmental control.*

Consistent with the clearly articulated

national thrust, many branches of federal and state governments are reordering priorities and resources to give increased emphasis to matters related to environmental study, control, and improvement. Inevitably, increased funds will become available for this heightened activity.

The range of possibilities for scope of activity in this total interest is broad and varied. Preservation and improvement of the physical environment including natural resources come to mind immediately. The reduction of the exposure of people to rodent and insect vectors and improper housing and space use are problem areas long overdue for intensive and exhaustive attention. Population projections and trends, including migration problems, are pertinent concerns also.

The black college by reason of (1) the number of its professionally qualified personnel, (2) its physical proximity to many of these and allied problems, (3) its historic commitments to people who occupy the lower socioeconomic strata of society, and (4) its genuine desire to be involved is well suited to make important contributions to this developing state and national concern.

Many of these schools have good biology staffs and growing numbers of biology majors at the undergraduate level who could expend the energy originating from their deep-rooted social consciousness in pursuit of solutions to important real life problems. A large number of the black schools, also, are experiencing an increase of students who have expressed an interest in sociology, social work, and political science. Professional staffing in this area can be managed satisfactorily. These two specific academic fields are cited merely as examples of the potential existing at the predominantly Negro colleges and universities for assuming, with adequate financial support and appropriate commitments from their respective governing boards, possible new roles.

5. *The Negro college could be the states' principal educational agency in those areas where there is no other established, multipurpose public institution of higher education.*

One prominent recent decision by a governing board illustrates this new role which could be assumed by predominantly black schools. The State Board of Higher Education of North Carolina by official action has declared that Fayetteville State University, which for a long time was restricted to being a teachers' college, will assume, under the auspices of the state, major and basic responsibilities for administration and implementation of the total program of higher education in the Fayetteville area, including the extension program conducted at nearby Fort Bragg. The ultimate effect of the latter provision transfers responsibility from the University of North Carolina at Raleigh to the state university in the area although it is predominantly and historically a black school.

This exciting action by the North Carolina State Board of Higher Education is, it seems, fully consistent with past recommendations of the Southern Regional Education Board's Commission on Higher Educational Opportunity in the South. Commenting on the action, *The Fayetteville Observer* in an editorial described the move as "a wise step which promises to be a fine example for other Southern states in the approach to desegregation in higher education."

In conclusion, it would seem defensible to propose that the major problem is not whether there are new roles for the predominantly Negro colleges and universities or what those roles are or could be, but rather to what extent those agencies and boards responsible for the Negro institutions are committed to the implementation of new roles which are identified.

# The Black College Must Turn Black

*Henry Allen Bullock, Professor of History-Sociology,*
*University of Texas at Austin*

I have been in college teaching for two-fifths of a century, but never before have I seen a crossroad so clearly marked as that which stands before the black college today. The crossroad is a symbol of the apparent conflict that exists between most college administrators and their students. It is characterized by two conflicting ideologies: the administration's faith in carrying on business as usual; the students' inclination to turn reconstructionist. After long and hard consideration, I have chosen to side with the students. I would like to tell you why and to present the rationale upon which my decision has been based.

Basic to all I have to say is the very strong conviction that the school, any school, is an adaptive institution which not only trains for adjustment to the prevailing demands of an existing social order, but also generates leadership that provides a built-in gyroscope for keeping a society within reasonable range of the trajectory prescribed by its goals. When the society veers too far away from this trajectory, the leadership fires a proper rocket that will set it on its course again. The school, therefore, is both an accommodative and a reformative agency.

American educators are not accustomed to talking in this language—at least not the whole language. They can understand the accommodative part but not the part that denotes societal reform. This is so because American education has really never been a reconstructionist institution.

As we examine the history of American public education, we observe a very close relationship between the social and political framework upon which the society is built and the philosophical principles upon which its public education is formulated. Our public school system began under Puritan influence and was constructed for the purpose of providing religious instruction for all our children. When, by the 20th century, we had received millions of immigrants to our shores, our public schools turned toward the job of "Americanizing" and integrating the newcomers—to training them not only to speak English but also to accept the American culture around them. As our industrial order developed and we needed more skilled and learned people to operate and manage factories and to sell the products manufacturing produced, our schools responded by adjusting curricula to reflect this fact. We increased our emphasis upon industrial and technical education, added courses in typing and shorthand, and built schools of business administration and engineering all within the very fabric of the university complex. There is nothing wrong about this. I use it here only to remind us that American education has been an accommodative institution.

However, built into the very society whose ideals the schools were reflecting were certain necessities of change the schools were ignoring. As we advanced technologically, we came more and more to depend upon a labor-management oriented social organization. The development of corporate enterprises made it such that more and more people worked for fewer and fewer people. Therefore, it was in the cards—the entire societal deck—that the relationship of labor and management would become strained and that new social alignments between these two classes would become necessary. Here was a clear case where efficient social accommodation would require efficient constructive social reform.

But nowhere in the history of American education do we find that either public schools or colleges actually took the leadership in establishing this much-needed linkage in our social order. The linkage had to be forged outside the established social order. And in the process, this chapter of American labor became one of the bloodiest in the history of the American nation. There *is* something wrong with this. I use it here to illustrate the brutal fact that American education has not been a reconstructionist institution.

The black college has tended to follow the line of American public schools and colleges generally. Not only has it reflected this historical trend, but it has been a very poor imitator. Conceived by whites, financed by whites, controlled by whites, with teachers dominated by whites and teaching a curriculum oriented toward white values, it has been a white school

for a black people. In an ordinary situation, this would be an ordinary accommodation to a normal social requirement.

But history documents and contemporary events clearly show that the social climate within which the black college has had to operate has not been ordinary, that the requirements to which it aimed to adjust were not normal. For example, it was teaching the intricacies of the political structure to youngsters whose parents could not even vote; it was teaching them the nature and strategies of corporate enterprises for which their parents could not even work, except as a janitor or a maid or a truckdriver; and it was teaching them all the history about all the people of the world except their own people. This is a discontinuity between our schools or colleges and our objective social order that calls out for change.

Indeed the opportunity for change is already here. It is within our grasp, though one fears that it will slip through our fingers like so many worthless grains of sand. There is dangling before American education generally the opportunity for colleges and secondary schools to turn reconstructionist.

Since the turn of the 1960's, when black youngsters moved out of their colleges to launch the great sit-in movement, we have had this opportunity. This movement was only the vanguard of a huge corps of college and high school intellectuals—with a scattering of rabble-rousers added—who were to question the morality of the social order, to demand greater representation in decision-making as related to their own education, and to demand that their education be more "relevant" to the vital issues that confront them as citizens. Because we had always told them what to do and only suddenly found that they would no longer obey us, we have turned a deaf ear to the very serious call for educational help that runs beneath their deviancy. We have become so hung-up over their long hair, abundant beards, peer-group lingo, and nonconventional dress—the outside of the individual—that we have been unable to conceive of the educational needs symptomatic of these overt forms of behavior.

The black college youth who started all of this has been saying even more. In his demands for black studies—often vociferous and occasionally violent—he has been saying that the black college should turn black, that what it teaches should be more germane to the life he actually faces, and that it has some obligation to adjust him to that life and to provide him with such tools as will facilitate the adjustment of that life to him and his needs. In its simplest form he would have the black college do for him what the white college *has* done for its students and what it *ought* to be doing. In short, he too would have the college turn reconstructionist.

The health of American education requires and the life of American society as we have known it demands that we heed these warning signs. It has been a tradition of our turbulent society that what we cannot change by operating within the social order, we change by operating from without it. Our nation was born under the stress and strain of this conflict, and all really great changes within it have operated along these mutually exclusive alternatives. Civil disobedience and violence operate through our colleges because we have made no room for effecting social change from within them.

I suggest that the black college create this room for effecting social change from within. I suggest that we do this by turning the college black like it is supposed to be. I suggest that we do this not for the purpose of training revolutionary cadres nor for the purpose of a "cop-out," but simply to bring the education of black people directly in line with the conditions under which they live in this country.

The black college should teach "blackness." This does not mean some absurd conception like teaching black mathematics, or black chemistry, or black anything. It means that a solid core of its curricular structure should have a black focus. I only have time to illustrate what I mean here. I mean that all of the social sciences, behavorial sciences, and the humanities should be presented to the student through the point of view of the black experience. The void that slavery placed across his historical background should be filled, for the black youth can develop no wholesome image of himself and his people until this void is filled. This does not mean he will miss American or even world history but that he will get it as it happened rather than as historians have been wont to relate it.

As the black college youth studies American government and the process of political decision-making, he should be taught to assess the political power of his own people and how this power can be increased. This does not mean that he will miss American government but that he will learn it as the political tool it is supposed to be.

When we give him economics, we should give him "blackness" also. It is good to make him study General Motors and Standard Oil, but he must also understand the pros and cons of the idea of organizing corporate structures for his own people. It is most difficult to imagine his study of price structures, for example, while ignoring the price differentials imposed by business organizations that enjoy a virtual geographical monopoly in the black ghetto. He should learn how ghetto people are exploited by many of these businesses and what is actually being done to reduce this exploitation. In short, he should be taught the conventional economic models, but he should also learn how to modify these models to fit the black experience.

This is the kind of thing I mean when I say the black college should turn black. There is no reason in the world why black students should study psychology unmindful of the psychological conditions under which their people must grow up. The entire socialization process, so important in social psychology, can be explored under a black focus. We teach him that the self is shaped through the influence of other people, how what we think ourselves to be is based upon what we feel other people think about us. We teach the black college student about George Mead's "I," his "me," and his generalized "other," or about Charles Horton Cooley's "looking-glass self." However, we seldom indicate how these important elements of the making of the social self are tragically refracted by the conditions under which black children grow up. I submit that this not only is a deceptive form of education to which the black college youth is exposed but is a reinforcement of the very racism with which this society is plagued. It is a reinforcement made all the more evil since it comes from a black college.

Just one other illustration of the pedagogical function of the black focus. This time I would like to turn to the humanities, particularly linguistics. We have had a terrific hang-up over standard English, requiring everybody to take it and to speak it. We have succeeded in getting everybody to gain at least a smattering of knowledge of it but have failed woefully in our attempt to get everybody to speak it. We have overlooked two possibilities: one, that speaking standard English is *not* an absolute value that everybody should internalize; the other, that standard English might *not* be functional for the conditions under which everybody lives. Why can't dialects live peaceably in a polycultural social climate? What if, in a given situation, dialects actually communicate more effectively and clearly than standard English? These questions are raised not to destroy the use of standard English; they are raised to establish the functional merits of American dialects. These dialects should be taught in black colleges.

What I have been trying to say is that if the black college turns black, it will close no doors to the black student's learning the established disciplines of human knowledge nor to his understanding the dominant white, Protestant, middle-class culture to which he inevitably must adjust. Through the black-focused curriculum, I have actually given two educations in one: a white education *and* a black one. But you may ask, "If he has trouble now getting only one education, how can we expect him to get two?" My answer would be "through the motivational force of what we have come to call 'relevance.'" My experimental research has shown that black retardation is actually more a function of the irrelevance of what the black student is being taught than of his inability to do college-prescribed work. To save our students and even our nation as we have known both, the black college must turn black.

# The Roles of Independent Colleges and Public Junior Colleges in Statewide Planning

*James M. Godard, Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity, Southern Regional Education Board*

## Independent Colleges

MOST of the independent colleges and universities in the South are enrolling black students. Although the number is small in comparison with the total number of black students in all post–high school institutions, there is evidence of increasing participation. For example, Duke University has developed a summer transitional program which has proved highly successful; the University of Miami has had a student-sponsored tutorial program which produced good results; Vanderbilt and Fisk universities have a joint program in black studies; the South Carolina Association of Independent Colleges held a one-day workshop at Furman University to explore ways in which they might expand opportunity for black students.

There is an awareness on the part of most private college administrators and faculty that their institutions have a responsibility to participate in opportunity programs. There is also a growing recognition that the composition of a student body should reflect the polycultural nature of society in order that students be prepared for participation in the contemporary world. The major obstacle to enrolling black students for these institutions is the cost factor, since many come from low-income families and need substantial financial assistance.

The independent colleges should be included, as they were in Florida, in statewide assessments of institutional resources for expanding post–high school educational resources for black students. If state financial aid programs are developed for economically deprived students, a case may be made for including the independent colleges as institutional resources where such aid may be used.

## Public Junior Colleges

In those states of the South which have developed a public junior college system, it is generally true that the two types of institutions enrolling the largest numbers of black students are the traditionally Negro college and the public junior college. It is difficult to see how the opportunity needs of thousands of black students can be met without an effective use of public junior colleges.

SREB is now conducting a three-year project on the role of the public junior college in expanding opportunity for black students. We have found that proximity to the junior college and low costs are the two reasons most frequently cited by these students for entering the junior college. In general the students we interviewed are satisfied with the instructional programs but are not satisfied with the degree of their own acceptance on the campus. We find increased understanding by administrators that an open-door policy is not enough and that other important steps should be taken if the college is to serve its black students effectively.

One of the most urgent needs in the junior colleges is for more black faculty and administrative staff, particularly in the field of counseling. Career orientation is of special importance, and we are advocating the creation of a new type of counselor position, perhaps known as "career associate," to be filled by a person whose initial training might be provided at the associate degree level in a junior college. He will be well-informed about realities of career opportunity especially for black people, about manpower needs, and about educational programs available in the state where students could secure the training they need once they understood their own aspirations. And most important of all, he will know how to communicate with these students. Where this idea has been explored, particularly in Virginia and Florida, and in Texas, we have found favorable response from business and industrial leaders as well as from educators who have had experience in working with black students. The career associate will be concerned with all students who need his services, not just with black students. But in a society where career opportunities for black students have been changing so rapidly, there is a particular urgency that states take steps to provide this type of service at all educational levels.

Since public junior colleges and traditionally Negro colleges share a major responsibility in providing opportunity for black students, it is most important that they explore ways in which they may be mutually helpful. Many students will move from the junior college to the predominantly black college. Instructional programs and transitional assistance should be articulated to the highest degree possible. And the traditionally Negro colleges could be an important resource in preparing staff for the junior colleges. The idea that the junior college is a threat to the senior college has long since been shown to be false. The task is rather one of mutual understanding of institutional roles and of joint planning which centers upon providing maximum opportunity to students. *State leaders could and should involve educators from these two types of institutions in constructive conversations on joint planning.*

### The Importance of State Planning

In 1967 the Southern Regional Education Board adopted a statement by its Commission on Higher Educational Opportunity which enunciated the goal of providing equal higher educational opportunity for Negroes in the South. To achieve the goal, the statement indicated, all types of educational resources, including traditionally Negro colleges and universities, should be engaged in a massive effort to provide equality of educational opportunity. Effective utilization of institutional resources depends upon joint planning. Up to now statewide planning for achieving equal opportunity in higher education for black people has at best been minimal. There are two reasons which justify increased efforts in this direction.

In the first place, it is doubtful that the goal itself can be achieved without cooperative planning. The task is a monumental one. The costs for its accomplishment are high. Diversity of institutional programs among a state's colleges and universities is an asset—but only if supported by a meaningful frame of reference devised for the general good and understood by the people.

In the second place, cooperative planning provides the only sensible basis for a response to federal requests for compliance, requests which are now being sent to states which once had a dualistic structure in higher education. These requests have produced confusion. No specific criteria have been established. The state has simply been requested to come up with its own plan. The absence of federal guidelines, while perhaps confusing, offers an opportunity for planning within a framework of criteria which are educationally oriented and operationally sound. A basic test should be the degree to which institutional resources are coordinated through careful planning, thereby supporting programs which in combination meet the needs of all students.

As the commission stated in 1967, the traditionally Negro colleges have a major role to play in expanding opportunity. Within the framework of statewide and coordinated planning, no institution needs to repudiate the cultural and educational values which were meaningful in the past and which may be adapted to contemporary social patterns and learning needs. Cooperation among institutions can be so structured as to eliminate discrimination without requiring a loss of institutional tradition and sense of identity. The primary goal is the provision of equal higher educational opportunity. Coordinated planning for this purpose should be the answer to compliance. We believe the states will benefit by giving high priority to this long-range planning.